FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-236
Monday
11 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-236 CONTENTS *11 December 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- 12th Round of Nuclear, Space Arms Talks End ... 1
  - TASS Announcement ... 1
  - Progress Described *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Talks Called 'Productive' *[TASS]* ... 1
- Bogachev Comments on Arms Control Issues ... 1
  - Chemical Weapons Ban *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Naval Arms Cuts *[TASS]* ... 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

- TASS on Changes in Socialist Countries ... 4
- Portugalov Discusses East Bloc Changes *[Vienna Radio]* ... 4
- E. Europe Leaders Cited on Warsaw Pact Meeting *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* ... 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 8 Dec ... 7
  - Central Committee Plenum Set 9 Dec ... 7
  - More on Central Committee Plenum ... 7
  - Results of Malta Meeting ... 7
  - Gorbachev-Mitterrand Talks ... 8
  - Roundup ... 8
- Analyst on Prospects for 'Helsinki-2' Conference *[Kulik on TASS]* ... 9
- Solton Examines Sources of Arms Trafficking *[Moscow International]* ... 10
- Conference Views USSR Trade Problems, Prospects *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* ... 10
- CEMA Official on Moves To Switch to Dollar *[Tokyo KYODO]* ... 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Shevardnadze on 'Cooperation' With U.S. *[TASS]* ... 12
- Bush Says Meeting With Gorbachev 'Very Productive' *[TASS]* ... 12
- Bush on Most-Favored-Nation Status for USSR *[TASS]* ... 12
- TASS Notes Nevada Nuclear Test ... 13
- High-Ranking U.S. Delegation Visits PRC *[TASS]* ... 13

China

- Jiang Zemin Moscow Visit Off Due To E. Europe *[Tokyo KYODO]* ... 13
- PRC Reservations on Cold War's End Noted *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* ... 14

Northeast Asia

- Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Plenum Begins *[TASS]* ... 14
- Rogachev Meets Berlin-Bound DPRK Vice Premier *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* ... 14
  - Stops on Way Home 6-7 Dec *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ... 14
- ROK Businessman on Lack of ROK-USSR Ties *[Moscow International]* ... 14

Near East & South Asia

- 'Arafat Aide Writes on Palestinian Struggle *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ... 15
- Lukyanov Receives New Libyan Envoy *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* ... 17

East Europe

- Four-Power Ambassadors Meet in Berlin 11 Dec ... 17
  - Berlin Initiative, Kohl Plan on Agenda *[Hamburg DPA]* ... 17
  - Conference Ends *[Hamburg DPA]* ... 18
- New SED Chief Cites Gorbachev on German Borders *[East Berlin ADN]* ... 18
  - Gorbachev Congratulates Gysi *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* ... 18
- GDR 'Renovation,' Reunification Sentiment Noted *[TASS]* ... 18
- Reportage on 8-9 Dec SED Emergency Congress ... 19
  - Modrow Draws 'Bleak Picture' of Economy *[TASS]* ... 19
  - Gysi Urges 'Modern Socialist Party' *[TASS]* ... 19
  - Further on Modrow, Gysi Speeches *[TASS]* ... 20
  - SED Committed to 'Democratic Socialism' *[IZVESTIYA 10 Dec]* ... 21
  - Gysi Interviewed on SED Congress *[Moscow TV]* ... 21
  - PRAVDA Summarizes Congress Proceedings *[10 Dec]* ... 22
- Possible SED Changes, Party Congress Previewed *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ... 23
- SED To Blame for Loss of Own Influence *[Moscow Radio]* ... 23
- PRAVDA: GDR Events Could Get Out of Control *[9 Dec]* ... 24
- Modrow Says GDR Government Under Control *[TASS]* ... 25
- GDR Security Chief Rules Out State of Emergency *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Dec]* ... 25
- Commission Redrafting GDR Constitution Meets *[TASS]* ... 25
- Political Activists Urge New GDR Constitution *[TASS]* ... 25
- GDR Trade Union Leadership Resigns *[TASS]* ... 26
- Gerasimov on Prague Spring, GDR Corruption *[Moscow TV]* ... 26
- CPCZ-Opposition Contacts, Ties Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* ... 26
- 'Many People Regret' Adamec Resignation *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* ... 27
- 11 Noncommunists in New CSSR Government *[TASS]* ... 27
- TASS Reports CSSR President's Resignation ... 28
- CSSR Government Formation, Party Crisis Viewed *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* ... 28
- New Political Leaders in CSSR Profiled *[IZVESTIYA 10 Dec]* ... 28
- CPCZ Plans Seen as 'Most Realistic' *[Latyshev in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 9 Dec]* ... 29
- Civic Forum To Respect Warsaw Pact Membership *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Dec]* ... 30
- Repression of CSSR, Hungary, Poland Condemned *[Mayorov on Moscow International]* ... 30
- Polish Minister Criticizes Kohl Unification Plan *[TASS]* ... 30
- Attacks on Soviet Monuments in Poland Deplored *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ... 31
- Poland's Siwicki Views Impact of Changes on Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Dec]* ... 32
- Personnel Changes at BCP Plenum; Mladenov Speaks *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* ... 33
- Bulgarian 'Union of Democratic Forces' Formed *[TASS]* ... 34
- 'No Alternative' to 'Deep' Reform in E. Europe *[Grammatchikov on Moscow International]* ... 34
- Mass Nature of E. Europe Events Stressed *[Ponomarev in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Dec]* ... 35

West Europe

- Mitterrand Says Support of Gorbachev 'Essential' *[TASS]* ... 36
- French Business Delegation Visits, Meets Leaders ... 37
  - Received by Deputy Premier Voronin *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ... 37
  - Talks With Ryzhkov *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* ... 37
  - Discuss Joint Ventures *[TASS]* ... 37
- France's Dumas on EC Discussion of East Europe *[TASS]* ... 38
- Genscher Cited on German Issue, Soviet Role *[TASS]* ... 38
- Silayev Views FRG Visit, Economic Ties *[TASS]* ... 39
- FRG Banker Sees Difficulties Facing Perestroyka *[IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]* ... 39
- W. Berlin Mayor Urges 'Sensible' E. Europe Policy *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* ... 40
- W. Berlin Socialist Unity Party May Disband *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* ... 40
- W. Europe Wants Review of Cocom Export Curbs *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* ... 40
- Transfer of U.S. B-52's to UK Criticized *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 5 Dec]* ... 41
- News Conference on Science Ties With Italy *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* ... 41
- Council of Ministers Greets Finnish Premier *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* ... 42

Supreme Soviet Greets Finnish President *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 42
Primakov at Finnish Envoy's Reception *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 42
Soviet Fishing Vessel Ablaze Off Bay of Biscay *[TASS]* 42

Latin America & Caribbean

Soviet Government Statement on Central America *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* 42
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Central America *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 43
Salvadoran Rebel Leader Denies Soviet Arms Supplies *[TASS]* 44
U.S. Unwilling To Halt 'Anti-Nicaraguan' Policy *[Rostovsev on Moscow International]* 44

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

CPSU Central Committee Plenum

CPSU Central Committee Holds Plenum 9 Dec *[Moscow TV]* 46
Plenum Speakers, Proceedings Reported *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 46
Gorbachev Speaks To 9 Dec CPSU Plenum *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 47
Gorbachev Remarks on Upcoming Congress *[Moscow International]* 56
Plenum Issues Resolution *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 57
Platform for 28th Party Congress To Be Published *[TASS]* 57
Gorbachev Announces Formation of Russian Bureau *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 57
Russian Bureau Members Named *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 61
Gorbachev Allegedly Criticized, Threatens To Resign *[AFP]* 61
Vyalyas Denies Allegation *[TASS]* 62
Ukraine's Ivashko Admitted to Politburo *[TASS]* 62
Background Given *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* 62
Medvedev Gives News Conference on Plenum *[TASS]* 62
Says Article 6 Subject to Change *[TASS]* 62
Slyunkov Assesses Economy, Plenum Results *[Beketov on Moscow TV]* 63

Congress of People's Deputies

Lukyanov Chairs Congress Preparatory Commission *[TASS]* 66
Congress To Promote Local Political Reform *[TASS]* 66
'Stormy Debate' over Article 6 Foreseen *[Glebov on Moscow International]* 67
'Thousands' Meet in Moscow To Mark Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 67
Deputies' Registration for Congress Continues *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Congress Credentials Committee Meets *[TASS]* 68
Gorbachev Chairs Meeting of People's Deputies *[TASS]* 68
Congress To Be Given 'Wide Coverage' *[Moscow Radio]* 68
TV Weekly Outlines Congress Coverage *[GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA No 50]* 68

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Chairs Presidium Meeting on 2d Congress *[TASS]* 69
Supreme Soviet's Political Divisions Described *[Prokhorov on TASS]* 69
Soviet Parliament To Broaden Political Contacts *[TASS]* 69
Primakov Chairs Privileges Commission Meeting *[TASS]* 70

Political & Social

Moscow Human Rights Day; 2-Hour Strike 70
Demonstrations on Article 6 *[TASS]* 70
PRAVDA: 'Provocative, Offensive' Slogans *[11 Dec]* 71
Further on Protest *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Demonstration Opposes CPSU Monopoly *[AFP]* 71
Police Break Up Democratic Union Rally *[AFP]* 72
Gorbachev Pictures Reportedly Burned *[Budapest Radio]* 72
Report of Gorbachev Offer To Resign 'Not True' *[Budapest Radio]* 72
Leningrad Rally Backs Gorbachev, CPSU *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 72
Medvedev on Rally *[Moscow TV]* 73

Moskvichev Lauds 'Objective' Reporting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 74
Leningrad Plenum Rejects 'Production Okrugs' *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 75
Leningrad's Gidaspov Outlines Local Progress *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]* 75
PRAVDA Explores CPSU's Vanguard Role *[8 Dec]* 77
More on 7 Dec Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session 80
1315 GMT *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Lithuanian Constitutional Amendment Dispute Viewed *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 82
Amended Articles 6,7 Reported *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* 82
Party Chief Brazauskas on Upcoming Congress *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
Authors of 'Threat' Mail Sought in Lithuania *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 46]* 84
Call for Dismissals at Riga Party Aktiv *[Riga International]* 84
Latvian Soviet Elections Previewed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 9 Dec]* 85
Elections Begin 10 Dec *[TASS]* 86
Latvian Activist Arrested; Arms Cache Found *[Klaipeda MARITIME PRESS SERVICE]* 86
Estonian Election Campaign Termed 'Fierce' *[Moscow TV]* 87
Intermovement Urges Boycott *[Stockholm Radio]* 87
Roundup of Estonian Local Elections *[Tallinn Radio]* 88
Discussions at Estonian Party Plenum Described *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 88
Estonia To Have Own Currency *[Stockholm Radio]* 88
Estonian Seaman Convicted of Smuggling *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 89
Armenians To Revoke Article on Communist Power *[AFP]* 89
Railroad Traffic for Stepanakert Resumes *[TASS]* 89
Azerbaijan Notes Tension Along Armenian Border *[Baku Radio]* 89
Armenian Deputies Appeal to Congress on NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
NKAO Administrator Volskiy Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* 91
Azerbaijan Bureau Members Meet Republic's People *[Baku Radio]* 94
Situation in South Osetia Reported *[Moscow TV]* 94
Turkmen Body Debates Economy, Elects Premier *[IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]* 95
Kazakhstan Issues Decree on Law, Order *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 95
Moscow City Party Holds Plenum 8 Dec 97
Prokofyev Delivers Report *[TASS]* 97
Plenum Condemns 'Rumors' About CPSU *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 98
Theses on Deputies Elections *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Dec]* 98
Slyunkov Chairs CPSU Socioeconomic Commission *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Commission Discusses Economic Reform *[TASS]* 99
Attendees Named *[Moscow TV]* 100
Ligachev Talks With West Siberians *[PRAVDA 9 Dec]* 100
Yeltsin Chairs Interregional Deputies' Meeting *[TASS]* 101
Lukyanov Radio Interview, Part 1 *[Moscow International]* 102
General Denies Danger of Military Coup
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 8 Dec] 103
Anniversary of Gorbachev UN Speech Recalled *[TASS]* 103
'Smooth' Diplomatic History Claim Rebutted *[IZVESTIRY 6 Dec]* 104
Letters Support Starkov, Editorial Staff *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 48]* 105
Removal of OKTYABR, MOSKVA Editors Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 49]* . 107
Mailbag Reveals Anti-Intellectual Sentiment *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 109
Deputy Minister Cited on Information Policy *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* 110

Scientific

Baykanur Space Center 'Deception' Revealed *[Paris AFP]* 112
Secret Nuclear Power Station Regulations Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 28 Nov]* 112
Belorussian Commission Discusses Chernobyl *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 3 Nov]* 113
Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant Accident Reported *[Vilnius International]* 114

Military

Yazov Addresses Moscow All-Service Assembly *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Dec]* 115
Yazov Sums up Results of Army Officers' Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 122
Yazov Congratulates BAM Railroad Troops *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Dec]* 123
Leningrad Rally Opposes Attacks on Army *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Nov]* 123

12th Round of Nuclear, Space Arms Talks End

TASS Announcement

LD0812152789 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Geneva December 8 TASS—The 12th round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms ended in Geneva today.

The delegations believe that their work has moved the USSR and the United States closer to concluding a treaty on a 50 percent strategic offensive arms cuts.

Special attention was paid to coordinating and developing measures to monitor the observance of the future treaty. An agreement was reached to examine each others' heavy bombers as an experimental control measure.

The delegation heads, Ambassadors Yuriy Nazarkin and Richard Burt, gave a joint news conference after the talks. Having noted differences on several issues, they expressed the hope that the Malta summit will boost the Geneva talks.

Progress Described

LD0812203289 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Geneva December 8 TASS—Ambassadors Yuriy Nazarkin and Richard Burt, heads of the delegations at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons, held a joint news conference at the Soviet Permanent Mission to the United Nations on the results of the 12th round of talks.

The news conference participants did not conceal that they did not make headway on some questions under discussion. "We have not achieved progress on space issues at the talks, despite the new approach put forth by the Soviet Union at Wyoming last September," Nazarkin noted.

This is also the case with major problems concerning air- and sea-based cruise missiles: The Soviet side is expecting a reply from the partners in the talks to the proposals set out also in Wyoming.

But the Soviet and American participants in the news conference noted that all this does not influence the prospect for concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons, since the Soviet Union clearly stated that it is ready to sign such a treaty, even if the ABM and space problem is not settled by this time. Nazarkin added that the new treaty would be signed, provided the ABM Treaty is observed, as it was signed in 1972.

The 12th round gave much attention to agreeing and drafting test measures of control over the observance of a treaty on strategic weapons.

For this purpose Soviet and American experts had a meeting, as a result of which, an understanding was achieved to conduct mutual inspection of heavy bombers to determine whether they are capable of carrying air-based cruise missiles. Letters on this issue were exchanged right after the end of the last plenary meeting.

Journalists at the news conference were very interested in the question of whether a treaty on 50 per cent cuts in Soviet and American strategic weapons will be ready by next June when the leaders of the two countries hold the next summit.

The two delegations will do their best not to thwart the schedule agreed off Malta, was the reply of the Soviet and American sides.

Talks Called 'Productive'

LD0912110289 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—Round 12 of the Soviet-U.S. nuclear and space talks, which ended on Friday, was "a productive round in which significant progress was made on a number of issues," U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher told journalists on Friday.

"In start, a major accomplishment of the round was the successful implementation of agreements reached at the September Wyoming meeting," he stressed, adding that the two sides agreed on "unit of account" in counting nuclear delivery vehicles.

Boucher said the sides also agreed to provide one type of heavy bomber to demonstrate verification procedures. The second measure on which the sides hope to reach agreement in the near future, he said, will provide for the demonstration of procedures for on-site inspection of reentry vehicles for each side's ballistic missiles.

The spokesman also pointed to progress in such issues as telemetry encryption during the test firings of missiles, as well as in some other issues. Boucher said the U.S. hoped that final agreement in a number of these areas could be reached in the next round of talks.

He also said that a group of Soviet experts would visit two SDI research facilities, but refused to provide any details of the visit, saying only that the SDI organisation would make an official announcement on that issue.

Bogachev Comments on Arms Control Issues

Chemical Weapons Ban

LD0712195389 Moscow TASS in English 1908 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

One of the important practical results of the Gorbachev-Bush meeting off Malta was that the Soviet and U.S. positions on the banning of chemical weapons moved closer.

Dramatic events have developed regarding the problem of chemical weapons over recent months, events that have jeopardised the prospects for a successful conclusion of the Geneva talks on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

Last October the U.S. press reported that the U.S. Administration had changed its stand at the conference on disarmament. It would continue to insist on its right to manufacture binary chemical weapons, even after the convention on a comprehensive ban of chemical weapons and the elimination of their stockpiles is signed.

It was announced that over the next ten years the Pentagon plans to deploy over one million pieces of binary chemical ammunition with a total value of three billion dollars.

This called in question the sincerity of the U.S. proposal to eliminate chemical weapons within ten years.

The U.S. side's rejection of the coordinated provisions of the future convention on chemical weapons caused serious concern even among the United States' allies.

A number of American senators and congressmen demanded an explanation for the administration's stand at the Geneva talks.

After the Malta meeting, the U.S. President agreed to terminate the production of binary weapons after the multilateral convention on chemical weapons goes into effect.

Bush proposed to sign at the 1990 summit an agreement on the destruction of Soviet and American chemical weapons even before the convention goes into effect, reducing stockpiles to 20 per cent of the present U.S. level.

According to the earlier published U.S. plan, the U.S. and the Soviet Union were to reduce their arsenals of chemical weapons by 98 per cent within the first eight years after the convention goes into effect.

Thus, only two per cent of the existing chemical armaments would remain in eight years' time. The U.S. side believed that this would ensure a margin of safety for the United States.

If all the countries that are capable of manufacturing chemical weapons, as well as countries that produce chemical weapons, agreed to the treaty, the stockpiles of chemical weapons would be reduced to zero over the subsequent two years.

The Americans now propose not to include in the convention the provision to maintain two per cent of the chemical weapons for a certain period of time. They suggest that this decision be formulated in a separate protocol.

Chemical weapons could be eliminated at a faster pace, than it is envisaged by the U.S. plan.

Certain doubts are also caused by the U.S. proposal to maintain two per cent of chemical weapon stockpiles virtually indefinitely.

Working out criteria to establish the absence of the potential to manufacture chemical weapons in countries that will not sign the convention may turn out to be difficult.

Some might be tempted to preserve chemical weapons under various pretexts for a considerable period of time.

Some provisions of the future convention on chemical weapons are yet to be specified and coordinated at the Geneva talks.

There are no doubts, however, that progress has been made during the summit off Malta. It is now possible to hope that the convention will be signed in the near future.

Naval Arms Cuts

LD0812214389 Moscow TASS in English 2122 GMT 8 Dec 89

["U.S. Stand Regarding Naval Arms Reduction—TASS Comment"]

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Washington's flat refusal to discuss naval arms limitation and reduction seriously complicates the process of confidence-building between the Soviet Union and the United States, and calls in question the U.S. Administration's assurances about its striving to lower the level of military confrontation on a balanced basis.

Representatives of the Washington administration declare that the chief aim of arms control is to reduce Soviet land forces as the Soviet Union is a land power.

This principal is turned topsy-turvy, when the question of the United States crops up. It is asserted in Washington that there should be no reduction of U.S. naval forces for the reason that the United States is a maritime power.

The Americans refuse to begin talks on spreading to naval forces the confidence-building measures similar to those that are coordinated for land forces.

The U.S. stand on naval arms is apparently explained by the fact that the United States has a considerable preponderance in naval forces and intends to retain it in the foreseeable future.

The double standards of the U.S. stand on naval arms evokes protest even of U.S. allies. Some NATO countries, above all Norway and Iceland, now conduct a vigorous campaign for the revision of the U.S. stand regarding talks on naval forces.

It is well-known that naval forces are among the most destabilising kinds of armed forces. They have a considerable offensive potential that can be used for dealing a first nuclear strike.

The composition of the U.S. naval forces now surpasses the needs for defending naval communications or coastal defence. They can be used on sea and can also deal strikes at land.

Many American experts criticise Washington's stand on naval forces. They emphasize that a huge part of the United States population inhabits the coastal zone. The main part of the United States economic potential is also concentrated in coastal areas.

These experts assert that naval reductions resulting from talks will enhance the security of the United States' most important areas.

Indeed, there is a proverb that whose house is of glass must not throw stones at another's.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Administration intends to preserve naval armaments which can threaten the territories of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

On the other hand, Washington insists on the ban on flat-firing submarines which can deal a retaliatory strike within two or three minutes on targets on the Atlantic coast, penetrating a most intricate ABM system. So Washington's double standards are visible again.

As regards the Soviet Union, it is prepared to take any measures that would help turn the world ocean into a zone of peace and cooperation.

The elimination of zones of military danger on high seas would help strengthen security of all countries, the United States included.

TASS on Changes in Socialist Countries

LD0712181689 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 7 Dec 89

["News From Socialist Countries—Round-Up"—TASS headline]

[Text] Bratislava. An extraordinary plenum of the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party accepted the resignation of all members of the Presidium and the Secretariat of the Central Committee and of the chairman of the Control and Auditing Commission of the party.

Until the extraordinary congress of the Slovak Communist Party, to open on December 17, party work will be implemented by an organising committee of 24 formed by the plenum. It was noted at the plenum that the leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist party is primarily responsible for the situation in the party and for the fact that society lost confidence in it.

Berlin. The Government of the German Democratic Republic called for an end to all actions directed against facilities and institutions of the National People's Army.

The Council of Ministers today issued the statement in connection with the fact that unauthorised persons have stepped up attempts to enter facilities and institutions of the National People's Army.

The government urges the citizens to remain calm.

Prague. Head of the Czechoslovak Government Ladislav Adamec said that he is constantly subjected to the pressure of ultimatums and the threat of strikes and rallies.

Appearing on Czechoslovak Television, he said that the cabinet cannot operate under existing conditions, and he believes he can do nothing but send in his resignation.

"At the recent talks in Moscow we received important support for our efforts to overcome the crisis," Adamec said. "We saw again that Mikhail Gorbachev understands our problems and Czechoslovak interests."

Ulaanbaatar. Mongolia's imports from the People's Republic of China will grow by 70 percent in 1990, D. Gotov, Mongolia's first deputy minister of foreign economic relations and supply, told a news conference.

He had just returned from China, where he signed a protocol on the mutual delivery of goods and payments between Mongolia and China for 1990.

Mongolia will be supplied with silk fabrics, clothing, fresh berries and fruit.

Mongolia will sell China products of animal husbandry, coal and fertiliser.

The volume of border trade will also grow. This will undoubtedly promote the strengthening of confidence and good-neighbourly relations between the two countries, Gotov said.

Portugalov Discusses East Bloc Changes

AU1012204389 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1100 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Interview with Nikolay Sergeyevich Portugalov, foreign policy adviser of the CPSU Central Committee, by Christian Schueller in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Schueller] The West has been surprised at the speed at which the old structures in Eastern Europe have broken down. However, one gets the impression that the Soviet Union was not well prepared for this either.

[Portugalov] Nobody in this world was prepared for the speed, for the acceleration, if you want to put it in this way. However, Mr Schueller, you should not think that we did not have an approximate idea of the direction or of the destination of this trip. We had a very good idea of it.

[Schueller] However, the reform has reached an uncontrollable speed. If precautions had been taken earlier would there not have been a slower transition...?

[Portugalov] [Words indistinct] It is, of course, very fashionable for an interviewee to ask a counterquestion, and for once I will take the liberty of doing this. What precautions would you have been able to take? How do you view this? We really do not want to interfere. We have not only postulated, but also practiced this, for example in Poland and Hungary. If there had been something totally counterproductive that could have made matters even worse, this would have been interference by us, regardless of its form, Mr Schueller.

[Schueller] However, Gorbachev gave Honecker a last fraternal kiss not so long ago.

[Portugalov] Well, you should regard the fraternal kiss as a matter of protocol. I do not think that it is something special, but consider, Mr Schueller, that it was precisely the official visit by General Secretary and President Gorbachev to the GDR on the 40th anniversary that gave the decisive impetus to all that happened immediately afterward and is still happening.

[Schueller] However, precisely the things that one tried to avoid have apparently happened now. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED], which is the only element of the GDR's identity, has gone to pieces. The almost logical conclusion is that reunification could be the only way out now.

[Portugalov] You know, all of this is greatly exaggerated. It is true that the old leadership and administrative structures have gone to pieces. We want to wait and see whether the GDR will go to pieces. By the way, I have just remembered, you said that the SED was the GDR's only legitimation. This is not the case. Considering geopolitics, geostrategy, and stability, the GDR's existence, with its present borders, is absolutely legitimate. One must not forget that.

[Schueller] Free elections are planned in the GDR relatively soon.

[Portugalov] What is wrong with that? Let us wait for the free elections!

[Schueller] What will the Soviet Union do if these elections result in the fact that a party that has completely different ideas about reunification than the USSR comes into power?

[Portugalov] Let us not try to cling to a certain scenario. Supposing the decision to dispose of autonomous statehood is made by the newly elected People's Chamber or by a referendum. You will ask what will happen then. Will there be alternatives? First of all, one will be permitted to say that the commitments of the two German states, or if your prefer, of the two German parties, to the alliances will continue to exist, at any rate as regards the Western powers. The same applies to us in the Warsaw Pact. So one will be permitted to ask [words indistinct] what will become of it. What will become of these commitments which are to be adhered to? The treaties have not been rescinded by anyone. This is the first point.

Second, is it not the case that in the West, and above all and not surprisingly in the FRG, the fact is deliberately forgotten that the late Chancellor Adenauer—and today his grandsons probably forget this deliberately or pretend to have forgotten it—cleverly included a withdrawal clause in all of the FRG's alliance treaties with the West? For—I am quoting freely from my memory—the Brussels Treaty, the Paris Treaties, and also the Rome Treaty say that, in the case of reunification, the FRG's commitments to the alliance resulting from these treaties would be totally destroyed. Germany, a reunified Germany, would regain full freedom of action as regards the alliance. What will happen then? What will happen then? What other ideas do you have about it? Whether a unified state, also in a confederation, is conceivable at all, considering that the two components, the FRG and the GDR, belong to different alliances, have foreign nuclear weapons on their territories, et cetera—this would be abstruse.

I can definitely imagine and I am almost sure that the evolutionary processes in the Warsaw Pact and the new interests will certainly receive a powerful response, also from NATO, and that the U.S. military presence—for the time being, the conventionl one—will be very much reduced in practice, that is, with the acceptance of the Americans themselves, and, above all, of their own accord. Then I could imagine a transitional period, a periode transistoire, as the French put it, in which the two alliances will be politically remodeled in the positive sense of the word and thus remain points of stability around which new structures that go beyond the blocs will develop as part of the pan-European process.

[Schueller] In the past few days the Soviet Union clearly rejected the 1968 invasion of the CSSR as a mistake. How unanimous and concurrent are the opinions on this in the party, in the party leadership, and in the Central Committee, which you know very well? How unanimous were the opinions at that time in 1968?

[Portugalov] Well, as regards the recent history, I am afraid I do not know. At that time, in those difficult times, I was one of your colleagues. I was only able to pick up information and was abroad anyway. It is a fact that there was no unanimity. Have a look at MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, which is also published in German. It gives very interesting insight and presents conclusions on all that happened in 1968. You ask about the party's unanimity in this respect today? Look here! If you want to want to know whether there are people who do not like this statement—I think that there are some. However, the decisive majority of the party and state leadership totally supports this statement. Otherwise it simply would not have been published in this form. In my opinion, this even came a little late.

[Schueller] For many people in the Soviet Union, Erich Honecker's GDR was also an example that demonstrated the opposite of Gorbachev's perestroyka, that is, the proof that there could be an economic reform without democratization.

[Portugalov] This is certainly true. I have no objection to this.

[Schueller] What happens now? What is the attitude of the conservatives in the Soviet Union toward the things that are happening there?

[Portugalov] I basically proceed on the assumption that President Gorbachev and his team, to the lower ranks of which I have the honor of belonging, [words indistinct] this policy unhindered. I am deeply convinced that those who do not like this direction of foreign policy will be the losers in any case.

[Schueller] Not a long time ago, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI sketched a portrait of Gorbachev that was in some way a pleading for a rather hard-pressed Kremlin leader, an appeal to the intellectuals not to cease to support him. One gets the impression that today the attitude of many intellectuals who have become more radical is more reserved toward Gorbachev. How seriously do you take this? How irreversible is this process?

[Portugalov] There is basically no other solution and no other way for us. Today this man is the incarnation of perestroyka, above all in foreign politics. As regards the intellectuals who allegedly or really disagree with him in some respects or are not so enthusiastic or want to achieve things more quickly and more radically, there are, of course, such people. But, Mr Schueller, this is the time of the great revolution. This period—every revolution is also implemented at the pace and with the methods of an evolution—will probably last for one generation. There is no other way. As far as I know, there is no revolution without resistance.

[Schueller] Gorbachev has ruled out that, in contrast to the apparent trends in Eastern Europe, there will be a multiparty system in the Soviet Union in the near future.

[Portugalov] Everybody takes his own course: You, because of your traditions, your development, and the objectively given opportunities, and we almost follow a set path. Did you say multiparty system? You know, without polemicizing, I refuse to consider the multiparty system in its fully developed Western form as the last parliamentary resort. Have a look at our parliament! There are no parties in the Western sense of the word, but the entire political spectrum from the right to the left and from the left to the right is completely covered in the Supreme Soviet and all the more so in the Congress of People's Deputies. Is this maybe—which is quite possible—a developing form of political pluralism which is more in line with our tradition? Of course, I cannot predict what will become of it.

[Schueller] You do not believe that, in contrast to the situation a few years ago, the Soviet Union is more impelled as regards domestic politics by the events in the neighboring states in Eastern Europe?

[Portugalov] No, I do not believe this. If you use this rather malicious expression, which I tolerate, that is, that we are impelled—we are, above all, impelled by our internal affairs, by the objective necessity to overcome the terrible bottlenecks in our economy. However, if this is done with the classical financial and industrial instruments of a (?bourgeois) democracy, the people will take to the streets. We cannot do this in such a drastic way as Erhard did in the FRG in 1948. We cannot cut the subsidies overnight and liquidate money in all fields through a drastic currency reform. We cannot do this. We have to proceed in a tactically clever way. You are telling me that this might be dangerous! However, this is simply the great policy of the revolution! Actually, our parliament is almost a convention, but, thank God, without a guillotine. This will never happen again!

E. Europe Leaders Cited on Warsaw Pact Meeting

PM0712115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Dec 89 Second Edition p4

[Roundup of TASS reports under the general heading "After the Meeting in Moscow"]

[Text] Sofia, 6 Dec—The Bulgarian public regards the first visit by P. Mladenov to the Soviet Union in his capacity as party and state leader of Bulgaria and his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev as a new boost for the traditionally close relationship between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. This is reported by BTA.

In the situation of dynamic political change sweeping the eastern part of the European continent, Bulgarian citizens attach even greater significance to Bulgarian-Soviet relations, which have been and remain a powerful stimulus for democratic changes in the country. The news agency emphasizes P. Mladenov's words that restructuring in the Soviet Union is developing in all spheres of life and that Bulgaria would like to make use of this experience.

Warsaw, 6 Dec—M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, has addressed a sitting of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, where he gave a report on the Moscow briefing meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

The Politburo highly appraised the results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and U.S. President G. Bush. The chances of achieving lasting, peaceful relations and new possibilities of cooperation in a changing Europe are increasing, it was noted at the sitting. The policies of all progressive forces, the PZPR included, must aim to help this process. The Politburo welcomed the statement by the leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, and the Soviet Union condemning the introduction of troops into the CSSR in 1968.

The PZPR Central Committee Politburo heard information from M. Rakowski on his conversations in Moscow with CPSU leaders.

Prague, 6 Dec—Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee, has spoken on Czechoslovak television. He said that a united viewpoint on the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia was expressed at the meeting of the Warsaw Pact leaders.

At the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, K. Urbanek said, we voiced the firm belief that it is necessary to further deepen comradely cooperation between the CPSU and the CPCZ on the basis of equal rights and solidarity. The two sides will adhere to the principle of sovereignty, independence, and noninterference in one another's internal affairs and support the development of equal, mutually advantageous economic and political collaboration. This has lasting, fundamental significance for Czechoslovakia. In our view, it is a firm guarantee of the security of our borders and the position of our state in postwar European development.

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 8 Dec

Central Committee Plenum Set 9 Dec

LD0812151189 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—Asked at today's briefing if the Communist Party Central Committee will hold a plenary meeting on December 9, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev said; "Yes, as far as we know, it will take place tomorrow. Traditionally, the Central Committee gathers before congresses of people's deputies to discuss related issues."

The Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies will open on December 12.

More on Central Committee Plenum

LD0812161189 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

As it has already been announced, a plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee is to be held tomorrow, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing today.

The plenum is expected to discuss measures for economic improvement, the stages of the economic reform and the drafting of the 13th Five-Year Plan (1991-1995).

Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov is expected to deliver a report on this subject.

Among other questions planned to be discussed by the plenum is the setting up of a bureau of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee for the Russian Federation, the biggest union republic.

Results of Malta Meeting

LD0812160489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Dec (TASS)—In the vast flood of assessments of the results of the meeting between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev off Malta, one can clearly discern the view that the profound and frank dialogue that took place between the two countries' leaders raises Soviet-U.S relations—and world politics as a whole—to a qualitatively new level. This was stated here today at a news briefing by Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

He stressed that high appraisals of the Mediterranean meeting were coming from both East and West. "In our view," said the USSR foreign ministry spokesman "the main result of the Malta meeting is that our countries have firmly embarked on the road of combining their potentials in the search for ways of resolving the problems facing modern civilization. In this uniting of the efforts of the two states that bear particular responsibility for the world's destiny we see a necessary prerequisite for the creation of a new world system in which the mechanisms of ideological and psychological confrontation and of reliance on force, which are characteristic of the now receding postwar period of the cold war will give way to respect for one another, trust, and constructive cooperation."

Dwelling on details of the conversations between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush on disarmament issues, Vadim Perfilyev noted that, in the strategic weapons field, discussion at a fundamental level was devoted to such issues as the problem of air and sea-launched cruise missiles, and the interrelationship of the 50-percent cuts and the ABM treaty. Moreover, the diplomat emphasized, the Soviet side "clearly indicated that the U.S. unwillingness to reach a decision on sea-launched strategic cruise missiles remains one of the main obstacles." "Without that, it is, in our view, difficult to expect the rapid conclusion of the treaty," he noted.

In the sphere of conventional arms, Vadim Perfilyev continued, three main issues need to be resolved for a treaty to emerge by 1990: A reduction not only of arms but also of personnel, a reduction in the numbers of troops on foreign territory (not only Soviet but also American), and a reduction in the levels of the air forces of the Warsaw Pact and of NATO.

At the Malta meeting the attention of the U.S. side was also drawn to the need to begin a serious dialogue on naval weapons, in connection with which the idea was put forward of discussing the possibility of the complete elimination, on the basis of reciprocity, of the tactical nuclear weapons of the navies of the USSR and the United States.

"On nuclear explosions," the Foriegn Ministry spokesman said, "It was agreed to finish work on protocols to the treaties of 1974 and 1976 by the next summit meeting. At the same time, we are proceeding from the fact that this is only one of the steps on the road to talks on the further limitation of explosions in number and power, having view in the future their complete cessation."

Touching on the issue of chemical weapons, Vadim Perfilyev reported on the positive evaluation by the Soviet side of the U.S. proposal on the conclusion of a bilateral agreement for an 80 percent reduction in arsenals.

"We have regarded attentively the declaration of the Americans about their readiness to forgo modernization of their binary weapons once a glogal convention—the conclusion of which may be accelerated by our bilateral agreement—comes into force," the diplomat added.

Gorbachev-Mitterrand Talks

LD0812170389 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—At the Soviet-French meeting in Kiev, Francois Mitterrand told Mikhail Gorbachev that the member countries of the European Community intended to deepen contacts and ties between East and West European countries. He also said that they planned to set up institutions, specifically a bank, to promote this process, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He said the Soviet president had in principle responded positively to this idea. There is a need to specify and continue the discussion of this matter.

Perfilyev recalled that President Mitterrand first suggested this idea in his speech in Strasbourg on October 25, 1989.

This is quite a new idea that should be implemented in specific stages, Perfilyev said.

The plan to create a bank to develop Eastern Europe was discussed at a special summit of the European Economic Communities on October 18 in Paris, Perfilyev said.

He said that as is known, the project envisages a large charter capital of some ten billion ECU's [European Currency Units]

Perfilyev said President Mitterrand had also proposed regular working conferences with the participation of all East and West European countries.

A session of the Council of Europe at the level of heads of state and government that opens in Strasbourg today, will have a detailed discussion of the plan to set up the bank, Perfilyev said in conclusion.

Roundup

LD0812182689 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 8 Dec 89

["Briefing at USSR Foreign Ministry's Press Centre—round-up"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—A plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee will be held tomorrow, December 9, a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry announced at a briefing today.

In a large number of evaluations of the Malta meeting between George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev, it is said that the two countries' large-scale, in-depth and frank dialogue at summit level is elevating Soviet-American relations and world politics as a whole to a qualitatively new level, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev said at the briefing.

He touched upon some details of the presidents' talks about disarmament issues, including discussions about the reduction of strategic offensive arms and conventional arms, chemical weapons, underground nuclear explosions, and naval arms.

The spokesman quoted Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in an interview with the Spanish news agency EFE. Discussing the settlement of the Central American crisis, Shevardnadze said that the Malta talks did not reveal complete unanimity of views on the problem.

However, Shevardnadze drew attention to the important fact that the United States and the Soviet Union again declared themselves in favour of a political settlement of the conflict.

During the Soviet-French meeting in Kiev, Perfilyev said, Francois Mitterrand informed Mikhail Gorbachev that the European Community member states intended to deepen contacts between the countries of Eastern and Western Europe and planned to establish institutions, specifically a bank, to promote the process.

The French president also made a proposal on regular working conferences with the participation of all East and West European countries.

Perfilyev announced the make-up of a Soviet delegation that will attend the forthcoming U.N. General Assembly's special session on apartheid and on its disruptive consequences in the south of Africa. The session will be held in New York on December 12-14. The delegation will be led by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy.

The spokesman expressed satisfaction with improving Soviet-Nepalese contacts in a number of fields of late.

He said that consular departments with limited functions, the main of which will be to issue visas, are being established at the mission of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Seoul and at the mission of the Korean Corporation for the Promotion of Trade in Moscow with a view to providing consular support for Soviet-South Korean contacts which are maintained at non-governmental level.

Sergey Kislyak, deputy head of the International Organisations Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, addressed those present within the framework of the briefing.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's address at the United Nations on December 7, last year, he said, became a diplomatic and practical platform for the Soviet Union's actions to democratise and humanise international relations and formulate a long period of peaceful development.

Analyst on Prospects for 'Helsinki-2' Conference

LD1012143289 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—By TASS political analyst Sergey Kulik:

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker who today begins a tour of several leading West European countries, will most probably express Washington's attitude to the prospect for a new European summit.

It would be a wishful thinking to claim that right after the Soviet leader proposed the early convocation of a Helsinki-2 conference on the Rome capital, it was immediately backed by all 34 potential participants in the summit.

Gorbachev's new initiative was a surprise for the U.S. administration. Eye-witnesses say that when Bush was asked to express his opinion about this proposal aboard the plane heading for Valletta, he tersely answered that he would discuss any proposed ideas, and after that would give a reply.

However, nobody heard the presidential "okay" to the Soviet proposal off Malta. American analysts claimed after the Brussels meeting that the White House attempted to replace the question of Helsinki-2 with the idea of a conference of 23 states participating in the Vienna talks and with the signing of a treaty on the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe.

THE BALTIMORE SUN newspaper wrote that Bush clearly intimated his cool attitude to the idea of a pan-European summit.

Did Washington's idea gain sufficient support? Of course it had supporters, as is the case with any idea. The British GUARDIAN newspaper noted that all know Mrs Thatcher's opposition to such Pan- European conferences.

On the other hand, the Malta summit was still in progress, when Dennis Deconcini and Steny Hoyer, heads of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe at the U.S. Congress, called on the President to seriously examine the Soviet leader's proposal and give a quick and positive reply.

Commenting on the new Soviet proposal, WASHINGTON POST diplomatic correspondent Jim Hoagland noted that it logically ensues from Gorbachev's vision of a new European order.

Other American analysts who have already embraced new political thinking, called on the administration not to perceive any call from Moscow for achieving European unity as Kremlin "intrigues" against Washington and opposition to cooperation between Europe and the United States.

On the contrary, they emphasised, the call for continuing the Helsinki process means that the United States and Canada, within the CSCE framework, may be also regarded European countries as any other states in Europe.

And what did West Europeans have to say on this point? Italian Foreign Minister Gianni de Michelis said that Gorbachev's call for Helsinki-2 is very important. This meeting will be held under the conditions when all its participants understand their affinity, above all, to a single civilisation and not to various ideologies, he added.

The Soviet initiative was backed by many West German leaders and heads of the Swedish and Dutch foreign ministries.

However, the pivotal turn in the question on a European Forum took place after the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Francois Mitterrand of France in Kiev.

The leaders of the two great European powers pointed to the need for a broad meeting within the Helsinki process due to rapid changes in Europe. The head of the French Government unequivocally supported a summit in 1990.

At the same time they outlined the rough draft of its agenda. The two leaders recognised that sweeping changes in today's Europe put forth many problems, including issues of how to make use of the instruments and structures which developed earlier, at the first stage of the Helsinki process, and which are operating now.

The need is also long overdue to speak of what new structures and forms of cooperation Europeans should adopt for the future.

Helsinki's final act signed in 1975 summed up the political results of the second world war. Since that time a new generation of leaders came to the helm in countries participating in the Helsinki process.

Only Nicolae Ceausescu and Agostino Casaroli can boast that they put their signatures under this historic document. All Europe was set into motion under the influence of perestroyka in the USSR and democratisation in Eastern Europe, the transition from mutual understanding to interaction in relations between Moscow and Washington and stepped-up integration processes.

Changes are seen everywhere. All of them are interconnected and influence one another. As a result, they make the idea of a common European home more pressing.

The participants in the Kiev meeting saw the main aim of Helsinki-2 in filling the idea of a common European home with a specific content and creating a new Europe where all nations from the Atlantic to the Urals will be equal partners cooperating and exchanging their achievements.

Gorbachev wants to draft a master plan of Europe's architecture for the post-cold war period at a new European conference, THE GUARDIAN reasonably concluded.

The two leaders in Kiev sent a compromise suggestion to Washington's proposal to hold a summit of 23 states: Let us make the signing of a treaty on the reduction of armed forces and agreements on confidence-building measures which will be signed in Vienna, a component part of a 35-nation summit within Helsinki-2.

In this context the holding of a European forum is quite substantiated in 1990, noted the French L'HUMANITE newspaper.

It looks like the constructive approach has also triumphed in Washington where, on receiving the news from Kiev, the administration has considerably adjusted its position.

In any case, in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper given on the eve of his present West European tour, Baker did not preclude a chance that Gorbachev's proposal on holding a new summit by 35 countries next year would be accepted with time.

In Baker's opinion, such a summit repeating the Helsinki agreement, should not be rejected. But he added that it should be thoroughly prepared.

Small doubt, nobody will object against such a preparation if it benefits the development of the Helsinki process.

Solton Examines Sources of Arms Trafficking

LD0712200989 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Yuriy Solton commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Hotbeds of tension don't die down in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Central America. Local wars are occurring, taking away human lives, undermining the local economy, and making international relations more complicated. In the view of our commentator, Yuriy Solton, foreign military deliveries stand in the way of settling these conflicts by political means. Yuriy Solton also makes this comment:

Weapons come to the warring countries from various sources. They are sold by individuals and by carefully camouflaged private companies. Arms sales deals are struck at state level. We may recall at this point the illegal weapons dealings with Iran carried out by officials of the American Administration, who used part of the money thus obtained to buy weapons for the Nicaraguan Contras and who were later brought to court for that.

It has been revealed lately something of this kind was done by high-ranking officials in the German Democratic Republic, apparently not without the knowledge of the former leadership of the country, whose affairs are under the investigation now. Along secret channels weapons from the German Democratic Republic went to Africa, the Middle East, and Central America.

Military help, too, goes along official channels. Among its suppliers there is the Soviet Union, the United States, and other countries. This help often adds fuel to the flames of local wars. Let's take the example of Afghanistan. One-and-a-half years ago the Geneva Accords came into effect. They paved the way for a political settlement in Afghanistan, but the war is still going on there. Two guarantors of the Geneva Accords—the Soviet Union and the United States—deliver weapons there, the first to the legitimate government of Afghanistan and the second to the rebels who are out to remove this government. Although a bit belatedly, Moscow accepted the American proposal for what is termed as a negative symmetry, that is, the mutual renunciation of arms deliveries to the conflicting sides, but now Washington decided to back out. There are reports saying that the United States and Saudi Arabia have agreed to spend $715 million on military supplies to the Mujahidin.

The Soviet Union takes an understanding view of the United States' concern with the situation in El Salvador and Nicaragua. Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed that during his meeting with President Bush, and also declared that the Soviet Union have its arms deliveries to Central America. [sentence as heard]

Why can't the United States take an understanding view of the Soviet Union's concern with American deliveries of weapons to Afghanistan, a country bordering on the Soviet Union?

Military operations in Cambodia, Lebanon, and Angola could stop if no more foreign made weapons were sent there. The Soviet Union's stand on regional conflicts is clear-cut. They should be settled only by political means, and maybe it's the right time now to think in earnest about setting up, say within the framework of the United Nations Organization, a certain mechanism that would help prevent the deliveries of weapons to various hot spots. The cause of a political settlement could only benefit from that, writes in conclusion Yuriy Solton.

Conference Views USSR Trade Problems, Prospects

PM0812102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "Perestroyka and Business. International Conference in New York"]

[Text] New York, 6 Dec—Businessmen in the United States and other countries have reacted with truly American efficiency to the summit meeting off the coast of Malta. A two-day international conference of representatives of the U.S. and West European business world and Soviet foreign economic organizations under the motto "Opening Up the Soviet Market: The Significance of Perestroyka for Global Business" ended here today.

Hundreds of U.S. and European representatives of business circles participated in the conference. They included D. Kendall, chairman of the board of directors of the Pepsico Corporation, D. Andreas, cochairman of the

American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council, U. Agnelli, one of the leaders of the FIAT automobile concern, O. Wolff von Amerongen, chairman of West German industry's Eastern Committee, and other industrialists and financiers among the elite of Western business.

The conference opened with a speech by S. Shepard [name as transliterated], chief editor of BUSINESS WEEK magazine, who spoke about the new prospects for economic cooperation between the West and the Soviet Union which are being made possible as a result of the meeting that has ended between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush. Numerous reports comprehensively examined practically all aspects of Western entrepreneurs' expanding trade and economic ties with Soviet enterprises and firms.

Despite the remaining complexities of doing business with Soviet foreign trade organizations, ministries, and departments—and many speakers here noted this—there is growing interest in the development of business cooperation with the USSR. This is accounted for not only and not so much by businessmen's sympathies with perestroyka, although these also play a considerable role, but by the potential importance of the Soviet market and Soviet production under conditions of the growing competition among the United States, West Europe, and Japan. There are other reasons, too.

"There are at least 20 reasons today why the present economic prosperity might collapse in a single hour," S. Tomson [name as transliterated], who attended the conference, told me. "Starting with the U.S. state debt and ending with the virtually zero growth in gross national product over many years...."

Against the background of such assessments the interest of Western business in business cooperation with us becomes more understandable: It is dictated not by altruism, but by a desire to secure itself under conditions of the extremely unstable world economic situation today. This is why G. Bush's decision to grant financial guarantees to U.S. businessmen developing business operations with the Soviet Union was greeted with such interest here.

"I prefer to bring together with Soviet enterprises those U.S. firms which, like yours, operate according to a strictly hierarchical principal of vertical subordination—things turn out better for them," Dzh. Kavulits [name as transliterated], president of the Kavulits International Company, told me. "Incidentally, we are now concluding an agreement with Minsk Motorcycle and Bicycle Plant to sell Soviet motorcycles in the United States. If the motorcycles meet the necessary ecological standards, they will be the first regular deliveries of Soviet industrial goods to the U.S. market."

CEMA Official on Moves To Switch to Dollar

OW0912121889 Tokyo KYODO in English 1036 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 9 KYODO—A visiting executive of the International Investment Bank on Saturday welcomed a proposal for establishment of a European Development Bank to assist East European economies.

Otto Kilz, deputy chairman of the Moscow-based bank, told KYODO NEWS SERVICE it was a positive proposal and the bank would cooperate for its materialization.

The bank serves as an outlet for development financing of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon), an East European economic cooperation organization.

Kilz described as not surprising recent reports that Hungary has proposed replacement of the ruble with the dollar as the monetary unit for trade settlements.

He said Comecon is studying all possibilities for the method of trade account settlement.

Kilz said the Soviet Union and all East European countries are interested in establishing financial offices in Tokyo. He made the remark in connection with reports that the Soviet External Economic Affairs Bank hopes to open an office in Tokyo.

Kilz said Hungary and other East European countries have moved to strengthen ties with the European Community. He predicted Hungary might join the European Free Trade Association as an initial step.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze on 'Cooperation' With U.S.

LD1012191989 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—The Soviet Union is not ready to consider the United States an adversary any longer and to openly declare that. It is ready to waive the previously prevalent views on Soviet-American relations as relations between eternal adversaries. The USSR is ready to cooperate with the United States, including cooperation in the military area.

"This thought, expressed by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to U.S. President George Bush during the Malta summit, is of the pivotal significance to gauge the importance of the unofficial Soviet-American summit," Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said in an interview for today's Face the Nation programme of the American CBS Television Company. Shevardnadze received its correspondent at the Soviet Foreign Ministry in Moscow.

The summit meeting was a breakthrough in the world outlook, the minister said. "If we do not consider you adversaries, if this is in tune with the sentiments of the American people and the American Administration, then we should build our relations in a new way at the new stage. These should be the relations of broadscale cooperation—economic, trade, scientific, technological and human exchanges. There should be new confidence now that we are entering a new stage in our relations," he said.

When asked whether he was surprised that President Bush brought for the Malta summit proposals to develop relations in the economic area, Shevardnadze said:

"I was not surprised since it is abnormal for the Soviet Union and the United States not to cooperate in economy. The two great states cannot ignore economic cooperation."

Shevardnadze said that when he was in the United States he discovered one-sided views of the USSR's economic potential. "Very frequently they think we are facing a catastrophy," he stressed. "This is incorrect and wrong. We have a huge potential and a very solid foundation. We have now new mechanisms of economic cooperation and management of the economy, the people have become interested in the results of their labour. In one year or two we shall have the effect."

Shevardnadze stressed that the USSR was not asking for aid, since such a country as the Soviet Union, with its population reaching almost 300 million, cannot solve its problems through aid. But both America and the Soviet Union are interested in and need mutually beneficial cooperation, he said.

Bush Says Meeting With Gorbachev 'Very Productive'

LD0912102189 Moscow TASS in English 0944 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—U.S. President George Bush, currently on a tour of the country, delivered a speech in Denver, Colorado, largely devoted to his meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Bush described his meeting with the Soviet President as "very productive."

"The seas and the rain really could not dampen the spirit of the Malta meetings," he said. "And I really believe in my heart of hearts—not just because it's coming up to the Christmas season—but I really believe that Malta will make a contribution to a more peaceful world, a world with more freedom, a world with more democracy."

"At Malta," the U.S. President continued, "President Gorbachev and I took our first hopeful step into a new American-Soviet relationship. We took our first step towards the next decade and the new world that is taking shape, a new world of security and freedom."

"Our mission to Malta was about peace," Bush noted, "not the kind of uneasy peace that we've known for the last 40 years—hard and cold—but about the new kind of peace we aspire to, one that is rich with the promise of permanence, one that forms a foundation for freedom and democracy throughut the world.

"Yes, there were differences at Malta," the President admitted, "But we could express them in an agreeable forceful way without being disagreeable about them."

Bush on Most-Favored-Nation Status for USSR

LD1012134189 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 10 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedayshin:

The United States President George Bush has said that the United States intends to take steps towards granting the most favoured nation [MFN] status to the Soviet Union.

"I think we ought to do that and we're going to take steps to do that," President Bush said on Friday [8 December] in an interview with a radio-station of Des Moines, Iowa.

"There has to be a trade agreement before we can waive the Jackson-Vanik, but then we go forward with MFN," he said.

During the Iowa interview the President was asked about a possibility for Iowa to be a site for the 1990 Soviet-American sumit.

"The locus has not been set for the summit," Bush said. "Let me tell you what I don't think was widely reported. One of the proposals we made was that we start very soon with the exchange of a thousand students. And I suggested to Mikhail Gorbachev that half of them ought to be in our agricultural colleges—their students coming to learn a lot about how we do things. And, frankly, I think that would result in a lot more trade eventually, not overnight. But, you see, the more of that kind of inter-action there is, I think the better."

The President was asked about a possibility for the USSR's joining the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). In reply, he underlined that the United States had already supported granting the USSR observer status in that important international organisation upon the conclusion of the Uruguay round.

"It is my view that given perestroyka, and given their steps toward change, they should become observers where possible in these international organisations," the President said.

TASS Notes Nevada Nuclear Test

LD0812223489 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] San Francisco December 9 TASS—American and British scientists set off a joint underground explosion of a nuclear warhead at the Nevada test site. U.S. Energy Department representative Jim Boyer said that the yield of the device codenamed Barnwell was between 20 and 150 kilotons.

According to Boyer, the device was tested at Britain's request in line with the British-American agreement of 1958 for cooperation on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defence purposes.

The two countries have carried out 21 joint nuclear tests since the signing of the document. The UPI news agency reports that the aim of most tests is to check reliabiity of existing nuclear weapons or to conduct experiments with their new systems.

The Barnwell charge was detonated in a pit at a depth of 666 meters near the Pahute Mesa volcanic plateau 105 miles away from Las Vegas.

Journalists who were present at observation posts during the explosion, said that it caused a powerful surface tremor raising a huge dust cloud 100 meters high. The seismic service in the neighbouring Colorado State registered a force 5.4 shock wave on the Richter Scale.

The Energy Department said that the test was a success, and there is no evidence of radiation leakage.

Nevertheless, many Las Vegas residents were worried over the tremor, about which they telephoned local radio and TV stations.

High-Ranking U.S. Delegation Visits PRC

LD0912165789 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 9 TASS—It was announced here today that a high-ranking U.S. delegation left for Beijing for talks with the Chinese leadership. White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said the delegation was led by national security adviser Brent Scrowcroft and also includes Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger.

The U.S. delegation, Fitzwater noted, will hold talks with the Chinese leadership on questions of global importance. They will also discuss the results of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting off Malta.

"The President has concluded that it is appropriate and in the long-term interest of the United States to inform the Chinese leadership of his discussions with the Soviet leader," the spokesman stressed.

He also said that Bush "views China as an important country in world affairs."

Beijing December 9 TASS—The U.S. delegation arrived in the Chinese Capital today. It was welcomed at the airport by Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Liu Huaqiu and other officials.

China

Jiang Zemin Moscow Visit Off Due To E. Europe

OW0912041589 Tokyo KYODO in English 0358 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Beijing, Dec. 9 KYODO—China has asked the Soviet Union to postpone a visit to Moscow by party chief Jiang Zemin that is scheduled next year, apparently in a bid to avoid a confrontation over their views of reform movements in Eastern Europe, informed sources in Beijing said Saturday.

Premier Li Peng, however, will visit Moscow in April to consult on promotion of bilateral economic cooperations, the sources said.

Despite the historic Sino-Soviet summit last May marking the recovery of normal bilateral relations for the first time in 30 years, the two communist nations have since had diverging views over reforms.

China's leadership, including senior leader Deng Xiaoping, termed pro-democracy and freedom movements evolving in East European nations in the past months as being a "deviation from socialism."

Li Ruihuan, a Standing Committee member of the Politburo, said China believes Soviet socialism, with a 72-year history, will not be changed by the will of one man, an apparent reference to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Eastern bloc nations, notably Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia, have taken steps toward a multi-party political system, declaring an end to a communist one-party rule, with the support of Gorbachev.

U.S. President George Bush and Gorbachev agreed at their Malta summit last weekend to encourage and support these moves.

China suppressed student democratic activities at Tiananmen Square last June and ousted reform-minded former General Secretary Zhao Ziyang. Government spokesman Yuan Mu said that these reform movements in Soviet bloc nations run counter to international communism.

PRC Reservations on Cold War's End Noted

PM0912182589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch: "PRC Government's Position"]

[Text] Beijing—"How do you assess the Soviet-U.S. summit in the context of the talks on the entire range of disarmament problems? Do you not think that the road to the achievement of concrete agreements will be shorter after Malta and that the disarmament process will now develop more favorably?" Your correspondent asked this of a PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman at a Beijing press briefing.

The Chinese Government, Foreign Ministry spokesman Jin Guihua replied, has always opposed the arms race. We proceed, he continued, on the basis that the United States and the USSR have the largest arsenals of both nuclear and conventional weapons. That is why these powers have a particular responsibility to end the arms race. China hopes that both countries will take practical steps and move in this direction.

The previous day the PRC Foreign Ministry had issued an official statement on the Malta meeting expressing the hope that the Soviet-U.S. meeting would genuinely help to reduce tension and stabilize the situation in the world without affecting the interests of any third country.

Jin Guihua was asked to comment on the assessment repeatedly heard that the summit marked the end of the "cold war." The PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman reacted to this request as follows. In his view, major changes are indeed occurring in the world. But the position-of-strength policy has not disappeared from the world arena, and attempts to interfere in others' internal affairs continue in international relations. This practice of strong-arm policy could undermine the easing of international tension and thereby lead to a continuation of the "cold war."

Northeast Asia

Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Plenum Begins

LD1112044689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian
0425 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 11 Dec (TASS)—The latest (seventh) plenum of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee is under way in Ulaanbaatar today. Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic, delivered a report "Topical Tasks of the Country's Socio-Economic Development." A debate on the report has begun.

The plenum will also discuss the question of convening the 20th Party Congress, and will examine an organizational matter.

Rogachev Meets Berlin-Bound DPRK Vice Premier

PM0712155389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Dec 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 5

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Kim Yong-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the Administration Council, and DPRK foreign minister, stopped over in Moscow 30 November en route for Berlin and Bucharest. I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, met and talked with him at the airport.

Stops on Way Home 6-7 Dec

PM1112095789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] DPRK Foreign Minister Kim Yong-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the Administrative Council, stopped over in Moscow 6-7 December en route for home.

ROK Businessman on Lack of ROK-USSR Ties

SK0812004189 Moscow International Service in Korean
1100 GMT 6 Dec 89

[Text] Soviet economic experts and distinguished scholars have held discussions with the representatives of the ROK [hanguk] business circles on the Soviet economic and political situation and on Soviet trade with the Asian and Pacific region.

Professor Mikhail Totarenko, director of the Far East Institute [IFE], and (Boris Neunylov), deputy director of the Economic Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, also participated in the discussions.

At the press conference with the business representatives, (Kim Yong-kon), an adviser to (Sinpung) Company, expressed his impression of the Soviet Union.

[Begin (Kim Yong-kon) recording] I thank the professors for their kind introduction. I think that the contents of their introduction were of great significance for us and will help us greatly in understanding your country. It was our first seminar here. However, if second and third seminars are held, I think many of us will participate in order to know and understand more about your country, and we will be able to achieve much in areas such as establishing joint venture companies.

In the United States, we attended a 3-day seminar led by Dr Sigur, director of the Research Institute for Asian and Pacific Affairs of the George Washington University. After this, we came to Moscow and attended a 2-day seminar held at this IFE institute here. From here, we will go on to Oxford in England and attend a seminar on Far Eastern and Northeast Asian affairs on economic, political, and diplomatic matters. [end recording]

[Announcer-read question] In the course of meeting with Soviet scholars, you must have discussed not only economic matters but also matters of political characteristics. We assume, for example, the Soviet perestroyka and its influence over the development of trade must have been discussed.

[Begin (Kim Yong-kon) recording] The members of the World Economics and International Relations Institute came to Seoul and held a seminar at the Hilton Hotel there. At that seminar too, the nature of perestroyka and Pacific affairs were discussed. We think that perestroyka will greatly contribute to world peace and will provide an opportunity to improve international economic exchanges and let mankind live in peace. In meeting with Korean compatriots living here, I realized they were hoping that the policy would succeed and, as a result, they would live a better life. I was very pleased to know this.

We, too, believe that the perestroyka policy will certainly produce good fruits. [end recording]

Next, Mr (Kim Yong-kon) expressed his opinion that the lack of diplomatic relations blocks the complete development of Soviet-ROK economic relations. With regard to this matter, he went on to add:

[Begin (Kim Yong-kon) recording] Newspaper editorials have been published saying that all of our people desire early establishment of diplomatic relations with your country—that is, diplomatic relations between Korea and the Soviet Union. I think this can be done sooner or later. This is because the Soviet Union has opened its trade office in Seoul and we have also opened our trade mission in Moscow. Mr Song is the chief of our mission in Moscow. Therefore, I think this will, not drastically but gradually and eventually, develop into diplomatic relations. I think this corresponds to the perestroyka policy. [end recording]

Near East & South Asia

'Arafat Aide Writes on Palestinian Struggle

PM1112094589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Bassam abu-Sharif (advisor to PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat, but not identified as such by PRAVDA): "Unvanquished. The Second Anniversary of the Palestinians' Peaceful Uprising"]

[Text] The intifadah was born on 9 December 1987—the Palestinian people rose up against the Israeli occupiers. Basically, it was a reaction to the unprecedented policy of terror that was being conducted against the Palestinians in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. It is resistance to the occupation, a display of insuperable will in striving for freedom. It is becoming increasingly obvious today that the intifadah will continue despite the Israeli Government's "iron fist" policy.

The uprising on the occupied territories was the result of a lengthy process, and the resistance, which began back in 1967, had been building up for years. The accumulated experience helped the Palestinian people to launch a lengthy, large-scale uprising. Palestinians throughout the occupied homeland are participating in it.

The main aims of the intifadah are to end the occupation, implement the right to self-determination, and create an independent state.

The intifadah is the embodiment of the Palestinian national character, the genuine essence of the people and their political aspirations. The protracted nature of the intifadah shows the depth of the Palestinian people's desire for independence. The Palestinians have demonstrated that they will endure any suffering and even sacrifice themselves to achieve their goal. A thousand Palestinians have already died defending the right to live in their own independent state.

The active involvement of all social strata in the intifadah shows that the uprising is not the result of the activity of a handful of political activists but an act of national self-defense and resistance. The Palestinians are not demanding an improvement in living conditions beneath the yoke of Israeli occupation. They want an end to the occupation itself. The intifadah is not an isolated act of desperation. It is an organized, cohesive nonviolent movement which cannot be intimidated by daily clashes with the powerful Israeli Army.

The movement's participants are calling for the creation of a Palestinian state, that is, their own state. They have chosen this form of political struggle in order to gain the right to self-determination. The Palestinians are not calling for the destruction of the State of Israel. On the contrary, they want coexistence between the two states.

The aims of the intifadah are embodied in the 15 November 1988 declaration by the Palestinian National Council. The council recorded in legislative form the decision to create two states (Arab and Jewish) and called for talks with Israel under UN auspices with the participation of the five permament members of the Security Council in order to achieve an all-embracing political settlement of the Near East conflict, which has been going on for 41 years.

The peace initiative put forward by PLO Executive Committee Chairman Y. 'Arafat a month later was categorically rejected by the Israeli Government. But this attitude did not impede the world community's noble efforts to establish peace in the Near East. At the same time, it has to be said, with regret, that the U.S. Government has displayed a marked reluctance to subscribe to this process.

In the opinion of the U.S. Administration, the so-called "Shamir plan" should be adopted as the basis for holding talks. At the same time, Y. 'Arafat's 13 December 1988 peace initiative was totally ignored by the United States. This approach to a Near East settlement can hardly be called balanced.

The first and basic idea taken up by the U.S. Administration is that the process should start with elections in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. In fact this plan was proposed by Shamir himself. Nevertheless, the PLO still regards positively any international efforts to accelerate the Near East peace process and is prepared to paricipate as constructively as possible in it. In particular, the PLO was positive about the idea of holding free and democratic elections in occupied Palestine as a political step in the direction of an end to Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. But it was Shamir, blocking the development of the peace process, who said that the aim of the elections is to form a Palestinian delegation to hold talks with Israel. That is absurd. All free nations choose their own representatives to a national parliament. It is they who choose delegations to conduct talks.

But that is not all. Subsequently, Shamir, writing in the paper YEDI'OT AHARONOT, warned that if one of the newly elected representatives voiced support for the PLO, he could expect to be jailed.

One could cite a long list of pronouncements by various Israeli officials indicating that the Israeli Government is not seeking peace but intends to annex occupied Palestine.

For instance, the "Shamir plan" calls the Palestinian people the "population of Judea and Samaria," which in itself defines the occupied territories as part of "Greater Israel." In an interview for the BBC, the Israeli premier called the West Bank and Gaza Strip "liberated territories," not occupied ones. Finally, Shamir continues to reject the idea of talks with the PLO and insists on holding talks with Palestinians of its choice. The Israeli Government still rejects the Palestinians' right to self-determination and statehood.

The Israeli Government's obstructionist stance was fully apparent in the two preliminary conditions Shamir put forward in connection with U.S. Secretary of State Baker's 5-point plan. The "Baker Plan" was supposed to pave the way for a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue in Cairo. The Israeli Government insisted that the PLO should be totally excluded from participation in the formation of the Palestinian delegation, whereas Israel should have the right to exercise a veto in relation to its composition. The Israeli leadership also demanded that the talks agenda should be confined to a single point—elections on the occupied territories, thus ruling out altogether a discussion of peace settlement problems.

President 'Arafat officially stated that the PLO is willing to hold talks with the Israeli Government without preliminary conditions.

It is now clear that the Israeli authorities do not intend to implement the demands of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, demanding that Israel liberate the Arab lands occupied in 1967. It is also clear that the Israeli Government plans to annex the West Bank and Gaza Strip in exactly the same way as it annexed the Syrian Golan Heights.

The main danger is that this Israeli stance not only means the continuation of the abnormal and inhuman situation that obtains on the occupied territories, but also means an intensification of the sense of disappointment and hopelessness among the Palestinians and other peoples of the Near East. And this, in turn, opens the door to new conflicts in the Near East. It is also possible that the intifadah will turn from a Palestinian phenomenon into one that embraces the entire region. That kind of development would be bound to rock the Near East and lead to destabilization, when stability is the very thing that this region of vital importance to the whole world needs.

The responsibility for the settlement of the conflict rests not only with the Palestinians. The responsibility is borne by the entire world community and, in particular, by the UN Security Council. The superpowers and other permament members of the Security Council have made repeated attempts to persuade Shamir to start the peace process. But the Israeli Government is employing maneuvering tactics to gain time and suppress the uprising. But the intifadah is so deeply rooted in the people that the Israeli occupying forces are incapable of crushing it; they can only increase the Palestinian people's suffering. One possible result of the present situation is the creation of favorable conditions for extremists who are seeking to torpedo the peace process.

That is why the discussion of Near East issues by the two superpowers' leaders during the Malta meeting is particularly important. The Israeli Government must realize that the world community will not allow it to implement its annexationist plans.

On the other hand, the Palestinian people will continue to make every effort to achieve peace. They will continue the struggle for their freedom. Resistance to the occupation will continue as long as the occupation exists. Israeli violence will give rise to nothing but resistance, and its strength will steadily increase. We will continue to carry out plans for general strikes and a campaign of civil disobedience. In tandem with this, we will embark on the creation of the foundations of our independent state.

The course of history is not halted by those who still dream of capturing others' lands, of enslaving other peoples. This historical process is developing under the influence not only of the Palestinian people's heroic resistance, but also of those courageous Israelis who realize that the creation of an independent Palestinian state is the sole stability factor that will help safeguard lasting peace in the Near East. Both the Palestinians and the Israelis who are struggling for this are in fact building a better future for the generations to come—Arabs and Jews.

Over the past 41 years the Palestinian people have suffered more than any other people in the world. Therefore, the Palestinians will never cause other peoples suffering.

The Palestinains have been deprived of their homeland. Therefore they understand better than many the true meaning of the concept of the homeland.

The Palestinians have been deprived of basic human rights. Their rights have been constantly infringed over the past 41 years. That is why they are so resolute about the defense of human rights all over the world.

They are demanding the creation of their own state, not the destruction of any other people's state.

They want to live and let live. But they are also prepared to die defending their right to be free.

vanov Receives New Libyan Envoy

112155189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 6 December Salih 'Abdallah Salih Rayyani, secretary of the Libyan People's Bureau (ambassador) in the USSR, presented his credentials to A.I. Lukyanov in the Kremlin.

Accepting the credentials on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and its chairman, A.I. Lukyanov spoke in support of the Libyan people's right to choose their own, original path of development and the steps taken to overcome the hotbeds of tension in North Africa and normalize relations with neighboring countries. It was stressed that in present-day conditions it is particularly important to develop cooperation between all forces with an interest in consolidating the change for the better in the international arena. The proximity or coincidence of Soviet and Libyan stances on global problems of today and the level of political dialogue reached create favorable preconditions for continued fruitful collaboration and a deepening of multifaceted ties between the two countries.

East Europe

Four-Power Ambassadors Meet in Berlin 11 Dec

Berlin Initiative, Kohl Plan on Agenda

LD1112110589 Hamburg DPA in German 1017 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin (DPA)—The ambassadors of the four victorious powers met in Berlin on Monday at a conference about the Berlin initiative of the Western powers. The Soviet Ambassador Vyacheslav Kochemasov arrived first in his Volvo outside the Allied control council building in Schoeneberg. He was followed by Vernon Walters (U.S.), Sir Christopher Mallaby (Great Britain), and Serge Boidevaix (France). None of them replied to questions from journalists. The building in which the Four-Power agreement on Berlin was signed in 1971 is being guarded by strong police forces and dog handlers. Kleist Park was searched on the previous day.

In a surprise move the Soviet Union had announced last week its willingness to start talks on the Berlin initiative. The ambassadors, under the chairmanship of Walters, are also likely to touch on the Ten-Point Plan of Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (Christian Democratic Union) on German affairs policy and other concepts regarding steps leading to a German confederation. Sir Christopher said that if the Soviet side wants to talk about the latest developments in the GDR, then one is prepared to listen.

The Berlin initiative goes back to the former U.S. President Ronald Reagan. He suggested 2 years ago an expansion of international air services in Berlin and international events such as competitive sports in the two parts of the city.

For a long time the USSR treated the wish for a serious discussion of these proposals reticently, wanting to confine them to issues affecting West Berlin. In August Moscow declared its willingness for preparatory talks at working group level below the level of envoys.

That this meeting is now being held by the ambassadors themselves is, in the view of observers, due to the speedy internal developments in the GDR, which Moscow is following with concern. It is thought possible that the

Soviets may consider a temporary revival of the Four-Power administration of the whole of Berlin.

After the overthrow of the Honecker leadership the GDR gave up its insistence on an "independent political unit" for West Berlin under the occupation regime, and now agrees to its inclusion in all arrangements with the Federal Government.

Conference Ends

LD1112135989 Hamburg DPA in German 1331 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin (DPA)—The talks by the ambassadors of the four victorious powers ended after 3 hours on Monday afternoon at the Berlin control council building. It was said afterwards that further talks could take place. The Western ambassadors submitted their proposals on the Berlin initiative. Soviet Ambassador Vyacheslav Kochemasov noted them favorably.

All the ambassadors agreed on the importance of stability and expressed their confidence that the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union could contribute toward this on the basis of the Four-Power Agreement.

The Soviet ambassador made "a number of general remarks" which would be conveyed by the Western ambassadors to their governments. The exchange of views took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

New SED Chief Cites Gorbachev on German Borders

LD1112164189 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1600 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, according to Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Chairman Gregor Gysi, has expressed the view in a telephone conversation that the borders between the two German states "must remain untouched". This emerges from a copy of an interview, prereleased to ADN in Bonn, which Gysi gave to the Hamburg magazine STERN. The SED chairman said that during the telephone conversation on Sunday evening Gorbachev argued that "a precedent would be created for Europe" through changes in Germany. "Desires for changes of borders in Europe would soon follow. This would spell the end of stability." Gorbachev, Gysi said, also explained that he "places the greatest value on the sovereignty of this country and also on the preservation of this party."

On the discussion in the SED about renaming the party, Gysi said that there is no consideration for choosing the name Socialist Party of Germany and the acronym SPD. The proposal to choose "People's Party" as the new name seemed to him "too vague", Gysi added. Choosing a name is "a very difficult task", and he wants above all else to prevent any division of the party over this. If the former state party has to go over to the opposition, he fears "a power vacuum which no one else can fill".

Gysi said he is receptive to the development of a performance-oriented middle-class economy in the GDR, to capital transfers, and to joint ventures with the West. This would be possible "only under the condition," however, "that the key industries remain under national ownership and that there are social guarantees".

Gorbachev Congratulates Gysi

PM1112151389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev greetings message: "To Comrade Gregor Gysi, Chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Gysi!

Please accept my congratulations on your election as party chairman.

We wish you, your party comrades, and all who value the interests and prosperity of the sovereign GDR people success in the democratic renewal of society.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

GDR 'Renovation,' Reunification Sentiment Noted

LD0812193689 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 8 TASS—By TASS correspondents Vadim Chudov and Konstantin Savvin:

The German Democratic Republic is stepping up renovation processes. The Central Democratic Bloc, uniting the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) and four other parties and public organisations, has ceased to exist. New forms of interaction have emerged.

A "roundtable" talk held last Thursday recommended that new elections to the People's Chamber (Volkskammer) be held on May 6, 1990 and that a new constitution of the GDR be worked out.

The participants in the "roundtable" talk were unanimous in their view that a new constitution should be confirmed at a national referendum in 1990, after new elections to the People's Chamber. It is necessary to draw up constitutional changes to hold new elections, read the adopted statement.

An emergency congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is opening in Berlin on Friday night. The party's Working Commission will report on the situation in the party and will also advance proposals to transform the Socialist Unity Party of Germany into a modern socialist party.

A working commission has already announced a platform "for alternative democratic socialism."

"Anti-fascists and many people of good will," it says, "have favoured the creation of a better Germany ever since the end of World War II. Hundreds of thousands of SED members were among them. We cannot put up with the contempt and hatred directed against this majority of our party.

"We are against the nationalist solution of the German issue. We favour a solution in the spirit of the democratisation and demilitarisation of Europe, based on trust and cooperation between the GDR and West Germany," the document says.

It also confirms SED's commitment to its alliance with the Soviet Communist Party and to the comprehensive development of friendly relations between the GDR and the Soviet Union.

The situation in the German Democratic Republic remains difficult, according to the GDR's government spokesman Wolfgang Mayer. He told journalists in Berlin that the current situation was caused by former leading party functionaries' abuse of power and corruption.

In his address to the people of the GDR, National Security Minister Wolfgang Schwanitz said the current events could lead to unpredictable consequences for the country and its citizens. Speaking at a news conference, he said that the Council of Ministers had passed a decision to restore order and security in the republic.

Schwanitz said that there had been attacks on district departments of the National Security Ministry. Many security guards are injured. Asked about the possibility of a state of emergency, Schwanitz said that such a measure had not yet been discussed. No law in the GDR provides for such a measure. Despite the fact that Schwanitz has banned aimed fire, some people are trying to escalate violence.

The recent public opinion poll held from November 2 to 27 showed that 92 percent of the respondents feared an aggravation of the economic situation, 43 percent—the escalation of violence.

More than 1,500 people older than 15 years old, as well as about 1,200 senior school pupils and students of higher educational establishments and vocational training schools were polled.

Eighty-four percent of those polled preferred Prime Minister Hans Modrow, 61 percent—the People's Chamber President Guenther Maleuda and 52 percent—Acting President of the GDR State Council Manfred Gerlach.

Only 23 percent of the respondents rejected the idea of reunification with West Germany, 29 percent were more "against" than "in favour", and 32 percent were more "in favour" than "against". Sixteen percent said they would welcome such a step.

Schools will now be closed on Saturdays, because of mounting transport difficulties in many districts.

Reportage on 8-9 Dec SED Emergency Congress

Modrow Draws 'Bleak Picture' of Economy

LD0812212589 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin 8/12/ TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

GDR/Modrow

Premier Modrow Calls for Pure and Strong Party

Berlin (ADN)—GDR Premier Hans Modrow, a senior SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] official, has called on SED members not to let the party break up or decline. In a speech at the opening of an emergency party congress here on Friday night, Modrow urged delegates to "make the SED pure and strong".

The existence and the peace of the country were endangered, Modrow said in his report on the state of the country. Therefore, saving the GDR was the prime task to which everything else had to be subordinate.

The unification of the two German states was not on the agenda, Modrow said. The long-term prospects of the relationship between the two states had to be left to the future and was part of the development of the whole of Europe.

He drew a bleak picture of the economic situation of the country. November saw the lowest-ever performance in terms of working hours. He said foreign investment to overcome the economic crisis would be welcome in the GDR as it would ease the pressure on it.

Gysi Urges 'Modern Socialist Party'

LD0912074789 Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin 8/12/TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

Call for Alternative to Stalinism and Capitalism

Berlin (ADN)—Prominent lawyer Gregor Gysi, a member of the special working group of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), told an emergency party congress here on Friday evening he was for the "GDR to embark upon a third road beyond Stalinism and monopoly capitalism."

The GDR people, all its parties, political and mass movements were at a crossroads today: Which way the GDR should turn? The coming weeks and months would set a course bringing on fundamental changes in the living conditions of each individual.

Therefore, the SED must be turned into a modern socialist party. To loud applause from the delegates, Gysi opposed demands for the party's dissolution or new foundation which, he said, would be a catastrophe. Proposed new names were "Party for Democratic Socialism," "German Socialist Party" or "Socialist People's Party."

Socialism as practiced to date had led to a political and economic crisis, to corruption and abuse of power. "Here and in other socialist countries it proved incapable of making an effective contribution to solving the problems facing mankind," Gysi said.

The situation in the country and the party had required this emergency congress and its early convocation. The party needed a leadership again to counteract the manifestations of dissolution and to regain capability of action. The election of a new leadership was the prime task today but could not be fulfilled without stocktaking, self-assessment and self-determination, Gysi added.

Further on Modrow, Gysi Speeches

LD0912181689 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 9 TASS—The first phase of the work of an emergency congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) ended in the capital of the German Democratic Republic today. About 2,700 delegates discussed matters connected with the renewal of the party and a change in the content of its work.

A report "On the Situation in the Party and the Country" was delivered by Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR's Council of Ministers.

He said in particular that "the very existence of the state which we live in is now at stake. The first priority task is to preserve the country. It is essential primarily to take care of maintaining law and order everywhere.

"This also applies to ensuring the preservation of evidence of law-breaking, of the abuse of power and corruption on the part of the former party and state leadership.

"As the prime minister I am stating that the coalition government will do everything to expose lawlessness," the speaker emphasised.

"But when exposing instances of abuse of power and corruption, there should be no room for lawlessness. State bodies for the maintenance of order should perform their duty. In this they need support from the whole of society."

When giving an evaluation of the country's economic situation, the speaker emphasised that "there are both grounds for concern and gratifying moments."

He said in particular that "plans for the sale of finished products to the population have been fulfilled in all branches of industry and the livestock procurement plan has been fulfilled in agriculture in all aspects and in all districts." Before November 30 the industry carried out almost 99 percent of the planned export deliveries to socialist countries. As regards export to the Soviet Union, the indicator was 99.8 percent, he said.

Touching upon foreign policy problems, Modrow emphasised in particular that "our allies, just as the Government of the GDR, believe that reunification of the two German states is not on the agenda.

"One should not speak of 'reunification' altogether, because the term is an anachronism and engenders fears of a Great-German chauvinism. Our allies, primarily the Soviet Union, count on sovereign GDR which, from the viewpoint of foreign policy, creates prerequisites for political stability in Europe."

In this connection the speaker pointed out that "the basic interests of other countries, France and Britain, for example, are also directed towards the existence of the two German states."

He also recalled that during the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev U.S. President George Bush reaffirmed that the United States is also faithful to the existing borders, the existence of the two German states and the realities of the postwar times.

"Reunification of the GDR and the FRG is not a vitally urgent political issue. No one cherishing sound and peaceful development should artificially push it forward and, still less, to make it an instrument of the election struggle. I caution against this all too categorically," Modrow emphasised. "At the same time the two German states make an important contribution to the demilitarisation in the centre of Europe."

Then a report on the renewal in the party and society was delivered at the congress by Gregor Gysi, who is heading the commission for investigation of cases of the abuse of power and corruption.

Speaking of the results of the commission's work, Gysi stated that the commission primarily dealt with matters connected with violations of party rules. The commission arrived at a conclusion that some earlier cases of expulsion of Communists from the party by the Central Committee ran counter to the party rules.

"I believe that the obtaining situation is connected with wrong structures of the party, since an undivided authority of one party leads in the end to an autocratic power of the leadership."

The speaker expressed the opinion that socialism is a social system in which any possibility of undivided political or economic authority should be ruled out and where economic efficiency is inseparably connected with the economic, social and cultural interests of the people.

Touching upon relations between the GDR and the FRG, Gysi said that now that a common European home is being built and when the role of statehood in Europe diminishes, the very idea of forming a new single state contradicts common sense. The matter concerns cooperation and meetings at all levels but at the same time the preservation of the GDR's sovereignty, too.

In ensuring discussions many delegates voiced the will of thousands of party members to prevent a dissolution or split of the party. A demand was put forward to create a socialist party of the working people on the basis of a realistic definition of socialism.

With this end in view, it was suggested that the party be given a new name and that new party rules and a programme be worked out.

It was also suggested that elements of a market economy be introduced in particular in agrarian production and that the policy of state budget grants for various production units be reconsidered, at the same time keeping the achieved living standard through payments to citizens.

The delegates adopted "A Report on the Discussion on the First Day of the Work of the Congress". This programmatic document, addressed to all members of the party, calls on them not to wait for the elaboration of a new line and begin to act energetically already now.

The participants in the congress resolved to continue its work on December 16.

The delegates elected Gregor Gysi as the chairman of the SED, with 2,588 delegates, or 95.32 percent of votes, favoring his candidacy.

An SED board was elected. The board at its meeting elected Hans Modrow, Wolfgan Berghoffer and Wolfgang Pohl as deputy chairmen of the party.

SED Committed to 'Democratic Socialism'

PM1012185289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Gregor Gysi—The New Party Leader"]

[Text] Berlin—Party leadership elections have been held at the extraordinary Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) congress. On the eve of the congress it was decided to abolish the Politburo and the post of general secretary and elect a party board with a chairman.

Gregor Gysi received 95 percent of the votes. He is 41 years old, head of a collegium of GDR lawyers, and well known as an advocate of radical reforms in the party and the country—something evident in particular from his speech to the extraordinary congress. He had been among the speakers who addressed a protest rally of half a million people in Berlin on 4 November. He was part of the working commission which temporarily, during the period of preparation for the extraordinary congress, stood at the head of the party in place of the Central Committee and Politburo which had resigned, and he was head of the group investigating the activities and abuses of power by former members of the SED leadership.

In the final part of the congress sitting, which lasted for more than 16 hours, a 100-member party board and also an arbitration commission were elected. The congress unanimously voted against disbanding the party.

The overwhelming majority of delegates supported the Auditing Commission's proposal on the party's behalf to apologise to the people for the fact that the former SED leadership had led the country into a serious crisis, which placed the GDR's existence in jeopardy, and expressed gratitude to all those citizens who, by their mature, bold actions, had ensured that the country had turned in the direction of radical reforms and thereby given the party the opportunity to begin its own revolutionary self-renewal.

The congress made a decisive break with the policy of the former leadership: abuse of power, suppression of the people, and authoritarian methods of running the party. It unequivocally adopted a course of democratic socialism.

In connection with the party's change of policy, it was decided by an overwhelming majority of votes to change the party's name. There are several suggestions for the new name, including the Socialist People's Party of Germany. The final decision on this question will be made at the end of next week, when the congress delegates will meet again to continue their work.

On Saturday it became known that the GDR prosecutor general has instituted proceedings against former SED leaders Erich Honecker, Willi Stoph, Erich Mielke, Guenther Kleiber, Werner Krolikowski, and Hermann Axen. They are charged with abuse of their official position and corruption, resulting in serious damage to the national economy, and also with personal enrichment. All the above persons, with the exception of E. Honecker and H. Axen, have been arrested. E. Honecker is in serious condition and under medical observation. H. Axen is at a clinic undergoing an eye operation. The homes of the aforementioned persons have been searched. The prosecutor general has acted at the urgent recommendation of the temporary commission of the People's Chamber; the commission has been specially set up to investigate cases of corruption and other unlawful actions committed by former party, state, and public figures.

Gysi Interviewed on SED Congress

LD1012205389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program, presented by A. Tikhomirov; interview with Gregor Gysi, new chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, SED, by correspondent V. Mostovoy; Gysi speaks in German with superimposed Russian translation; date, place of interview not given—recorded]

[Text] [V. Mostovoy] An extraordinary Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] congress started its work at the end of last week. In the process of stormy debates important decisions were adopted that are meant to preserve the unity of the party, which has found itself in a crisis situation. The congress elected new party leaders. Gregor Gysi, a lawyer, was elected SED chairman.

Comrade Gysi, how do you appraise the early results of the extraordinary SED congress? What, in your opinion, are the key tasks for the party today?

[Gysi] The congress began its work in an extreme situation, when the party had no leadership, and we first and foremost faced the key question of whether the party would remain or cease to exist. The second key decision: We are breaking for good with Stalinist traditions, although it is absolutely clear to us that declaring this is still a long way from actually eliminating these traditions. It is not a simple process; it requires time and effort.

It was also decided that the work of the extraordinary congress will be continued in the immediate future, so that new party rules and a program can be adopted and this will once again emphasize our break with the old traditions. But these are more complex tasks that require theoretical and scientific studies which should be based on real practice and the living conditions of the people in our country.

The majority believe the party should have a new name. This must be thoroughly discussed with the primary party organizations. We would like to resolve this issue in the most democratic manner. [video shows Gysi speaking toward camera]

PRAVDA Summarizes Congress Proceedings

PM1112120989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondents S. Baygarov, S. Zyubanov, and M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Following a Course of Renewal"]

[Text] Berlin, 9 Dec—The GDR is experiencing a very important event: Yesterday evening the extraordinary Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] congress opened in the capital. A total of 2,750 delegates and more than 90 guests from all districts of the country set to work. This, the German socialist state's top forum of communists, must resolve very important tasks. As NEUES DEUTSCHLAND wrote today, these consist of making a decisive break with the SED's Stalinist structures and forming a renewed socialist party that will be capable of leading the struggle with all other forces of goodwill in the country for alternative, democratic socialism.

Opening the congress, the chairman of the working commission for its preparation, Herbert Kroker, said that the election of effective leading bodies with the mandate of the lower party ranks is now vitally important to the party. This task cannot be put off any longer.

Delegates listened with great attention to the report on the situation in the country delivered by Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers. A storm of applause greeted his words that they must not allow the dissolution of the party linked with the names of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel, Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, Ernst Thaelmann and Rudolf Breitscheid, Wilhelm Pieck and Otto Grotewohl. This party must be made pure and strong, but now it is not only a question of the future of the party. It is a question of the GDR, this German state. Its existence is under threat, peace is under threat. The coalition government, the speaker said, is doing everything to safeguard law and order and to ensure that there are no unlawful actions during the exposure of abuses of power.

Discussing the country's foreign policy, the head of the GDR Government indicated the importance of maintaining political stability in Europe. He said that the unification of the GDR and the FRG is not on the agenda.

After the congress had established its working bodies, Gregor Gysi, a member of the working commission, delivered a report on forming a modern party of democratic socialism. The basic thrust of his report was that the crisis of the administrative-centralist system in the GDR can only be overcome by following a third path, different from both Stalinist socialism and the domination of transnational monopolies. This path is characterized by radical democracy and rule-of-law statehood, humanism, social justice, environmental protection, and genuine equal rights for women. We want to create a new party, the speaker said. He acquainted delegates with the working commission's proposals concerning the possible renaming of the party. It could be called the party of democratic socialism, the German socialist party, or the socialist people's party.

A considerable proportion of the report was devoted to abuses and breaches of the rule of law by the former SED leadership, which have caused the party serious political damage and placed it in a difficult position. As the speaker said, the commission for the investigation, which he headed, has received a vast number of indications of such abuses in this connection. However, as checks have shown, far from all of them correspond to the truth.

The discussion which began after G. Gysi's report reflected delegates' deep concern with the crisis situation in the party and the country. They strongly condemned the administrative-edict methods of the former SED leadership, its isolation from life and the people, and its subjectivism and arrogance. Cases of abuse of power, corruption, and personal gain, which are now public knowledge, are a source of deep indignation among delegates and all communists.

Delegates said the extraordinary party congress must answer the multitude of questions now being raised by communists at the local level. What kind of socialism should the party aim for? Should the party retain its name or should it be called something different? What kind of program and statute should the party have?

The congress work went on all night. Toward morning delegates began electing the leading party bodies. It was decided to abandon the old party structure consisting of the Central Committee and its elected Politburo. Henceforth, the structure that has traditionally existed in the German Communist Party and in German social democracy is to be revived in the party.

The congress delegates elected G. Gysi as chairman of the SED. A total of 2,588 delegates voted for him, which is 95.32 percent of the vote.

Gregor Gysi, the new SED chairman, became known in the party and the country quite recently. He is 41 years old, graduated from the law department of Berlin's Humboldt University, and has a doctorate in law. Since 1988 he has been head of the Berlin Bar and is also chairman of the GDR Bar Council. Gregor Gysi was one of the speakers at a rally of more than half a million people demanding renewal which was held in Berlin on 4 November and has also played an active role in many other mass events, speaking out in favor of restructuring and glasnost in the GDR.

The congress elected an SED Board of 100 people. A sitting of the SED Board elected Hans Modrow, Wolfgang Berghofer, and Wolfgang Pohl as deputy chairmen of the party.

W. Berghofer, also elected chairman of the commission on the political system, retains his position as burgermeister of Dresden. W. Pohl is head of the commission for organizational and party life. The following were also elected to the presidium of the SED Board: Monika Werner, Marlis Deneke [name as published], Lothar Bisky, Klaus Hepke [name as published], Hans-Joachim Billerding [name as published], and Helmar Hegewald [name as published]. M. Werner heads the SED faction in the People's Chamber.

A decision was adopted to continue the congress work on 16 December.

Possible SED Changes, Party Congress Previewed

PM0812145789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondents S. Baygarov and M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Extraordinary SED Congress"]

[Text] Berlin, 7 Dec—An extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] will begin its work Friday evening, a week earlier than originally scheduled. The working commission preparing this congress took this decision on the basis of the extremely exacerbated situation within the country and the party.

The first item on the agenda is a report from the aforementioned commission on the crisis within the party, the reasons for it, and proposals regarding ways of forming a new socialist party.

The SED has enough forces for radical renewal. The party is present in all spheres of the GDR. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND writes that these forces are not the party apparatus, which must be considerably renewed, changed, and cut back, while the party must be given back its functions of political and ideological leadership. Nor, of course, are they the former party leaders, many of whom have been expelled from the party for abuses and some of whom are even under investigation. It is in many respects owing to them that the SED lost its prestige among a considerable proportion of the GDR's citizens. No, these forces are the teachers, workers, plant directors, engineers, and scientists... All those people who acted according to their consciences and won prestige because they did not lose contact with the people and acted in people's interests as far as they were able rather than because they were SED members.

The main thing now, members of the working commission told us, is to avoid major disagreements at the congress between various groupings, each of which will naturally uphold its own option.

During the work of the congress it is also intended to elect the party's leading organs. It is quite possible that the congress will abandon the usual party structure, which presupposes the existence of a Politburo. Everything indicates that the party general secretary or chairman will be elected directly and the Central Committee will be elected separately. Proposals have been voiced during party debates regarding the formation of two working groups to elaborate a draft party program and statutes, which may be adopted at an extraordinary SED congress in May.

The SED's position is not as bad as people in the West are doggedly trying to depict it. Incidentally, the results of a sociological survey conducted approximately a week ago also indicate this. Some 31.5 percent of those polled voted in favor of a renewed SED. That is the best result of all the country's political forces. Some 9 percent and 7.9 percent respectively voted for the popular public organization "New Forum" and the Liberal Democrat Party.

SED To Blame for Loss of Own Influence

LD1112103989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] The extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] was one of the main political events of the last week. News agencies devoted a lot of coverage to analysis of its work today. Western journalists are wondering whether the SED will be preserved as a party during the crisis conditions the country is going through. Our correspondent in Berlin, Aleksandr Zubenko, reports on this:

[Zubenko] The country has been struck by a profound economic political and social crisis. The SED itself stood on the threshold of disintegration. More and more fresh instances of corruption and financial machinations by the former party leadership are coming to light. On the eve of the congress, the republic's procurator general decided to bring criminal charges against Erich Honecker, former general secretary of the SED Central Committee, and former Politburo members Willi Stoph, Hermann Axen, Guenter Kleiber, Werner Krolikowski, Erich Mielke, and Gerald Goetting, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union. They are accused of abuse of power, using their official positions to create privileges for themselves, and also of sanctioning the use of force against citizens during peaceful demonstrations and meetings.

The fact that the article that enshrined the leading role of the party in society was recently removed from the Constitution did, of course, affect the work of the congress. Members are continuing to leave the SED. To date, over half a million people have left the party; the party now has about 1.7 million members in its ranks. Many people are, of course, disillusioned with the party policy. But party hangers-on are leaving it, too—those who joined the party for opportunistic and careerist reasons. It is the party itself that is, of course, to blame for this, in my view. It created a situation in which it was hard to count on successful promotion up the official ladder without being a member of the SED. The congress changed the structure of the party leadership: Now a chairman will be at its head. Lawyer Gregor Gysi was elected to this post by 95 percent of the congress delegates. The party board was also elected, with 100 members. The congress adopted a decision on changing the name of the party; this will be determined during the second session of the congress, to take place next Saturday. As Gregor Gysi, the new party chairman, commented, if the party gets 20 percent of the votes cast in the elections in May 1990 that could be considered a positive result.

PRAVDA: GDR Events Could Get Out of Control

PM0812192589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondents S. Baygarov, M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch: "Worrying Days. Extraordinary SED Congress Opens"]

[Text] Berlin, 8 Dec—Today, the opening day of the extraordinary Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Congress, the initial document for discussion has been published.

The working commission to prepare this congress, which drafted the document on the basis of the numerous proposals from primary party organizations, resolutely advocates renewing the socialist society on the basis of the principles of democracy, humanism, and social justice. It is opposed to administrative socialism, but it does not want to import the monopoly capitalist society either. Stalinist party structures must be dismantled. The SED is against demagoguery, abuses of power, and corruption and in favor of a real rule-of-law state. A new constitution for the country must be drafted and legal reform carried out. The SED is in favor of holding as soon as possible free elections in which all the country's political forces take part. Even before the elections, all democratic political movements and forces must be given official recognition. At this new stage in the country's development the SED remains a socialist party with a new program and statute. The interests of working citizens are particularly close to it.

Our party, the document continues, is in favor of an alliance with the CPSU and the development of multifaceted friendly ties between the GDR and the USSR. The border along the Oder-Neisse is inviolable as far as we are concerned. The SED fully recognizes the GDR's obligations under the Warsaw Pact and is in favor of precise compliance with the Four-Power Agreement and also the Treaty on the Basic Principles of Relations Between the GDR and the FRG. Anyone who desires peace must work on the basis of realities.

Yesterday evening saw the first "roundtable," which involved 14 parties and groups, including the SED. The joint statement adopted after fierce debate recommends holding elections to the People's Chamber on 6 May 1990. It proposes that work on the draft of the new constitution begin immediately.

Meanwhile, the situation in the GDR is still extremely tense. Attempts are still being made to gain unlawful entry to various installations, including military installations. There are cases of clashes with guards, although weapons have not been used. One gets the impression that it will only take one spark for the situation to get out of control.

The sweeping accusations of corruption and abuse of power against all leading cadres are helping to fuel the hysteria. In particular, the accusations against W. Walde, former first secretary of the SED bezirk [area] organization in Cottbus, have not been corroborated. He lives with his family in an ordinary city apartment, does not have any hunting lodges or any other houses, and has never taken holidays paid for with party funds either in the Maldives or in the Bahamas, as he is accused of having done.

The country's government and the "roundtable" participants have again appealed to the population to stay calm. Even many West German politicians are urging GDR citizens to show prudence.

Leading party bodies will be elected at the extraordinary SED Congress. The delegates themselves will determine the course taken by the congress and how long it lasts.

Modrow Says GDR Government Under Control

LD0812131289 Moscow TASS in English 1056 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 8 TASS—The German Democratic Republic Government is at the controls and is counting on hundreds of thousands of diligent workers who are prepared to face up the tasks that lie ahead, GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow told journalists on Thursday.

The effectiveness of the government will depend on the people's involvement in reforms, he said.

Modrow called for measures to protect arms stockpiles and military installations.

Those who say "we the people" should be aware that they must work exclusively in the interests of the people. Every citizen bears responsibility for this, he said.

Modrow then vowed to combat corruption and abuses of power.

The government has already taken concrete steps in this direction he said.

"We cannot allow laws to be violated. Every citizen must know that the constitution of our country is still in force and that all laws are still in force," Modrow said.

Commenting on his meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev last Monday, Modrow said it gave him new enthusiasm.

The Soviet Union supports democratic renewal in the GDR, he said.

"Every citizen must understand that the GDR must remain a reliable partner of the Soviet Union, seeking better relations between the GDR and the Soviet Union," he said.

GDR Security Chief Rules Out State of Emergency

PM1112103989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[Own correspondent S. Maslov dispatch under the general heading "Events As They Are"]

[Excerpt] Berlin—[passage omitted] At a press conference in Berlin W. Schwanitz [head of the GDR National Security Office] said in response to a question on the possibility of a state of emergency being introduced in the country that "there is no talk of this at present." No GDR law provides for the announcement of a state of emergency.

Department personnel are showing discipline and using nonviolent methods as instructed. According to W. Schwanitz, he has given orders that "no aimed shot be fired." However, the fact that department personnel can only offer "unarmed resistance" is being used for unseemly ends. In the opinion of the head of the department, the threshold of escalation is now at its lowest possible point. There is a danger that serious damage will be done to the process of democratic renewal.

According to ADN, immediately after the announcement of the GDR State Council decision on an amnesty, unrest broke out among prisoners in jail in the City of Brandenburg, who feel that the framework of the amnesty is "unsatisfactory." At first the protest took the form of burning objects and fragments of equipment being thrown from windows. Some 70 prisoners then used violence to break out of their cells in an attempt to escape. Backed up by forces from the people's police, wardens were able to restore order without resorting to violent methods. On Thursday morning prisoners again demanded a "comprehensive amnesty" and are refusing to go to work or take food.

Commission Redrafting GDR Constitution Meets

LD0812130989 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 8 TASS—The first meeting of the commission to review and supplement the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic took place in Berlin on Thursday, in accordance with the decision taken by the GDR People's Chamber on November 18.

The commission is headed by People's Chamber deputy from the National Democratic Party of Germany Dr. Manfred Muehlmann. His first deputy is Vito Holland, from the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany, and other deputies represent the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany and the Christian Democratic Union, the GDR parliamentary press service reported.

The commission invites representatives of public movements, participating in roundtable meetings, and religious circles to participate in its work, the report said.

The commission unanimously stated that there was now the need to draft an absolutely new constitution. The first proposals on its content will be discussed at the commission's December 21 meeting.

Political Activists Urge New GDR Constitution

LD0812132789 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 8 TASS—Political activists called late on Thursday for elections to the People's Chamber on May 6, 1990 and for a new constitution for the German Democratic Republic.

Representatives from 14 political parties and organisations held a roundtable discussion in Berlin, emerging with proposals to help the country overcome its current crisis. The new constitution should be submitted for a popular referendum in 1990, they said, urging the people to prepare constitutional amendments setting new election rules.

GDR Trade Union Leadership Resigns

LD0912170989 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 9 TASS—The Central Board of the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions (FDGB) held its 12th plenary meeting here on Saturday.

Its Chairman A. Kimmel, the Central Board and the working Secretariat formed 10 days ago to prepare an extraordinary trade union congress resigned.

A preparatory committee of 32 representatives of all sectoral trade unions was set up at the proposal of sectoral and territorial trade unions and their grassroot organisations. The committee was put in charge of preparing the extraordinary congress, due to open on January 31, 1990.

Werner Peplowski, president of the Industrial Union of Printing and Paper Workers, was elected chairman of the preparatory committee.

Gerasimov on Prague Spring, GDR Corruption

LD1012204489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Dec 89

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Text] On 5 December a Soviet Government statement was published in the newspaper PRAVDA—in a quiet corner of page two, in line with the old tradition of presenting the most important news in passing, as it were. The statement expresses agreement with the Czechoslovak leadership's appraisal of the decision to send the armies of five socialist countries into Czechoslovakia in 1968 as mistaken. The short statement—along with the even shorter statement of the leaders of the five countries on the same topic—was published in PRAVDA under the text of a protocol telegram of gratitude from Nicolae Ceausescu. Those, then, were the priorities of the page editor.

Other countries have received this statement as a belated sensation. Ladislav Adamec, who has now resigned as chairman of the Government of Czechoslovakia, has welcomed the clearing of the obstacle of 1968. But he added that it would have been better still had this happened rather sooner. We are late in repenting. The new leadership of Czechoslovakia states that it fully supports the inspirational ideas of the Prague Spring, and it repudiates the document entitled: Lessons of Crisis Development, in which the need for the tank assault on the idea of improving socialism is explained. And so the cleansing thunderstorm has broken. It will restore the good names of the participants in the Prague Spring. But no one can mend the shattered fates by which academics became yard cleaners, while the general secretary turned forester.

It was a harsh sentence: 20 years of limbo. The official admission of a mistake will give our citizens, too—of whom there are many—the chance to exclaim: What did I tell you? But no one can restore the empty years of stagnation in inquiring thought and good work that started in August 1968. The tanks in Prague crushed our freedom, too.

There is another side: The U-turn in the appraisal of what happened then rather unseats those who were comfortably installed in the driving seat, and they complain that they have been betrayed. But it is perhaps rather they who did the betraying once upon a time, and now the chickens have come home to roost.

Events of no less a dramatic nature are occurring in the GDR. Not so very long ago, as one perused the volumes containing the speeches of Erich Honecker, as one watched the smart guards at the Brandenburg Gate proudly showing off their museum of the wall, or as one observed the impressive torchight processions on the 40th anniversary of the republic, everything seemed quite permanent and stable. There was criticism, but it was voiced in private—more and more about the lifestyle of the leaders. Now the number of Honecker's servants is being counted; the temperature in his private swimming pool is being taken. At the age of 23, in 1935, Honecker was thrown into prison by the fascists and spent 10 years there. Now he is under house arrest in his own country. An illustration of what was once said by a British lord, Lord Acton: Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Party members have felt betrayed by their leaders, and 1 in 10 has left it. After this terrible self-inflicted knockdown, it must get to its feet immediately. And in this, its extraordinary congress should help.

CPCZ-Opposition Contacts, Ties Viewed

PM1112084589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "High Degree of Responsibility Needed"]

[Exerpts] Prague—K. Urbanek, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee, met with the leaders of "Civic Forum" and the equivalent Slovak organization "The Public Against Violence" on 6 December in the Civic Center. The meeting was of a very open nature and both sides displayed a high degree of responsibility in their efforts to resolve the current situation.

On the initiative of K. Urbanek, an agreement was reached to hold as soon as possible a "roundtable" where representatives of various parties and social organizations will meet. The CPCZ has one aim today, K. Urbanek stressed, and that is to make Czechoslovakia a modern, flourishing socialist state providing social guarantees for working people, as quickly as possible. Both sides stated that they do not want unemployment or chaos in the country. According to "Civic Forum" leader Vaclav Havel, the CPCZ Central Committee general secretary expressed satisfaction at the talks and a desire to meet again in front of television cameras. [passage omitted]

The CPCZ Central Committee has declared the pamphlet "The CPCZ's Practices in the Struggle Against 'Civic Forum,'" made public in recent days, to be a forgery. The pamphlet is supposedly a methodical instruction to Communists.

A concert was held in Prague's famous "Lucerna" hall with the participation of K. Gott, G. Vondrackova, G. Zahorova, I. Korn and other artistes, whose proceeds will go to the striking students. The vehicle crossing in Bratislava on the borders with Austria has been practically empty for the third successive day despite the fact that in Czechoslovakia travel abroad is unrestricted.

'Many People Regret' Adamec Resignation

PM1012190389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "Government Still in the Process of Formation"]

[Excerpt] Prague—On 7 December L. Adamec, chairman of the CSSR Government, handed in his resignation, which was accepted. The president of the CSSR has entrusted Marian Calfa, first deputy premier, with the task of forming a new cabinet.

A pretty serious event. Yet the Czechoslovak mass media have given it rather scant coverage: The bare facts and nothing more. They are more interested in the future and in forecasts, which is perfectly natural. But the reasons for and assessments of the resignation? People have possibly only seen and heard about this in the television program "Dialog" with representatives of various parties and organizations, which was chaired by M. Pavel, general director of Czechoslovak television.

The question was raised by Z. Mlynar, a professor of political science who had come from Austria, who said that he was no unreserved supporter of L. Adamec but that the premier was right when he said in his television address the day before that ultimatums are unacceptable for normal government work and that calm is needed: "I would have given him at least 3 months of work without any threats and pressure." Mlynar was supported by the chairman of the club for socialist restructuring, "Rebirth," who said that a government cannot function under daily, hourly pressure.

Prague acquaintances have reminded me in our conversations that L. Adamec did quite a lot for restructuring and that, after 17 November, he was the first to enter into an open, honest dialogue with those who were known until quite recently here as "illegal groups." Evidently many people regret his departure from the stage of politics. [passage omitted]

11 Noncommunists in New CSSR Government

LD1012222689 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 10 TASS—A new coalition government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was sworn in in a ceremony held in Prague today.

Its chairman is Marian Calfa, member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Valtr Komarek, member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and Jan Carnogursky, a non-party man, are first deputies of the head of government.

Of the five deputy prime ministers, two are Communists, one represents the Socialist Party, one the Popular Party and one is a non-party man.

In the new government, there are 10 Communists, two representatives from the Socialist Party and two from the Popular Party. Seven are non-party persons.

Miroslav Vacek, member of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, retains the post of defence minister.

Jiri Dienstbier, a non-party man, has been appointed foreign minister.

P. Miller, worker of the Prague CKD factory, has been appointed minister of labour and social affairs.

The Ministry of Interior will be subordinated directly to the prime minister and two of his deputies.

The coalition government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is the fruit of long and complicated round table consultations whose participants were representatives of all the National Front member-parties, the Civic Forum and the Public Against Violence movement.

Marian Calfa was born on May 7, 1946 in the city of Trebishov in eastern Slovakia. In 1970 he graduated from the Law Department of Karolus University in Prague. Calfa joined the Communist Party in (?1964).

Calfa filled different posts in the offices of the government presidium. In April 1988 he was appointed a minister of the government, since December 1989 Calfa has been first deputy head of the Czechoslovak Government.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1022 GMT on 10 December adds the following: "All parties to the consultations, including a 'Civic Forum' delegation, expressed satisfaction with the results achieved."]

TASS Reports CSSR President's Resignation

LD1012170689 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 10 TASS—President Gustav Husak of Czechoslovakia in a letter addressed to the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Republic tendered his resignation from the post of the president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The news was reported by the official news agency CTK.

CSSR Government Formation, Party Crisis Viewed

PM1112140589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 89 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin report under the rubric "On the Spot": "What Should the Government Be Like? A Government of National Accord Has Been Created in Czechoslovakia"]

[Text] Prague—Czechoslovakia has not known for many years the kind of pressure which has recently arisen in its domestic political life. From 7 through 10 December the country essentially did not have a government. The formation of a government laid bare the entire complexity of the processes taking place in society.

The cabinet formed 3 December by Premier Ladislav Adamec failed to satisfy the opposition, primarily because most of the ministerial posts were still held by Communists. The opposition demands that half of all ministerial posts belong to nonparty people, and the remaining posts be distributed among three parties—the Communist, Socialist, and People's Parties. The second attempt to form a kind of government that might suit everyone was also unsuccessful. All this resulted in Ladislav Adamec's resignation 7 December.

In connection with the political crisis that erupted, representatives of the parties and public movements are increasingly asking themselves the question: What should the present government be like? The opposition's aim, and some Communists are in agreement with it, is early parliamentary elections. Only they can show the real correlation of forces and the degree of each party's influence. The date of the elections is already being given as the summer or the beginning of the fall next year. This schedule is dictated by the need to prepare for them. In order to hold genuinely democratic elections, the Federal Assembly is required to adopt several laws, including a new law on the elections themselves. In addition, new forces are entering the political arena, above all the Peasant Party, whose constituent congress is slated for 13 January, and the recreated Social-Democratic Party. The opposition believes that both these parties need to be given time to solve organizational problems.

It turned out that as of the very beginning of the working people's mass demonstrations two main forces have been leading the contest for political influence in society—the Communist Party and "Civic Forum." But the scope of political life is much broader.

On Friday evening representatives of "Civic Forum," and of the Communist, Socialist, and People's Parties met for talks on the new government's composition. The result of the talks was an understanding on a so-called government of national accord. Of the 21 Cabinet posts, 10 places are occupied by Communists, 7 ministerial posts have been given to nonparty people, and 2 each to representatives of the Socialist and People's Parties. Yesterday the country's president approved the new government's composition. Marian Calfa has been appointed head of the cabinet.

The events taking place in the Communist Party have pushed into the background the disputes around the government's formation into which the whole of society was drawn. It is experiencing a major crisis. Several trends have emerged inside the party. One of them is the Democratic Forum of Communists uniting more than 50,000 people. The forum advocates the party's radical renewal, clearing it of everything which has discredited the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] in recent decades. Many grassroots party organizations take the same stance.

There are instances of Communists refusing to carry out political-agitation work in labor collectives. In a number of industrial enterprises party organizations have disbanded. The Communists in them will now continue their activity at their places of residence. Czechoslovak television's party organization has announced its disbandment. The resolution adopted says that because television is directly subordinate to the government, no single political party should carry out work in its collective.

The main question for the CPCZ's future is to consolidate all the party's healthy forces. It was precisely under pressure from them that the date for convening an extraordinary congress was moved from 26 January to 20 December this year. Further development of the internal political situation will largely depend on the decisions to be taken by the party forum.

New Political Leaders in CSSR Profiled

PM1112104389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Emerging From the Crisis"]

[Text] Prague—On Saturday, Marian Calfa, first deputy chairman of the CSSR Government, who has been instructed to form a new cabinet, had another meeting with representatives of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] and other parties and organizations that had taken part the day before in the "roundtable" sitting in Prague's Palace of Culture.

These are people who have become very popular in Czechoslovakia during the last 3 weeks: B. Kucera, chairman of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party; V. Havel, leader of "Civic Forum"; V. Mohorita, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium; V. Komarek, director of the Forecasting Institute; I. Dienstbier, the well known lawyer; and others. The question of finding a solution to the political crisis is still being discussed, as well as the composition of the new government, which could possibly be announced Sunday afternoon. If no acceptable agreement is reached, "Civic Forum" will call another general strike.

However, judging by certain signs, a compromise is nevertheless a fairly realistic possibility. The "round-table" participants have published a joint statement which makes it clear that they have reached some accords and hope to be able to help the new premier ensure that his government can be sworn in by the CSSR president on 10 December. It is to be a government of national accord.

At a press conference given in connection with these events, J. Hora, CPCZ Central Committee press spokesman, answered, among others, a question about the future of Ladislav Adamec and whether the Communist Party was going to offer him work. He said:

"Comrade Adamec is of pensionable age, but I do not want to speak for him. He is greatly respected. Few have done as much for the party and society as he has done. He is the only person who can make the decision."

In answer to another question—how many former CPCZ members have asked to be reinstated in the party?—he said that there have been some such cases, but it is hardly likely to become a phenomenon on a massive scale.

The Action Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia, which, until a new Central Committee is elected, is being led by Pavel Bolvansky, a member of the party since 1986, has adopted an appeal, "A Word to Communists," which, among other things, contains an appeal to the CPCZ Central Committee to immediately suspend the CPCZ membership of Vasil Bilak and begin disciplinary proceedings against him as soon as possible for his flagrant abuse of power in the performance of highest-level party functions.

CPCZ Plans Seen as 'Most Realistic'

PM0912180189 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[L. Latyshev commentary: "Crisis or Rebirth"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] What is the present arrangement of forces in Czechoslovakia? All parties and organizations active in the political arena realize that the country must be brought out of the crisis as quickly as possible. Every movement has proposed its own platform to this end. Some of them see the solution as being to renew socialism, but there are also forces openly in favor of restoring capitalism or covertly conducting their policy toward precisely this end, hiding behind democratic and socialist slogans.

The draft Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) Action Platform looks like the most specific, the clearest, and, most important of all, the most realistic. The party has analyzed its mistakes with the utmost frankness and is now mobilizing all forces to restore its authority among the masses.

"Development in our society has fallen considerably short of socialist ideals," the draft platform says. "There have been serious deformations of socialism as a result of our past mistakes, which must be responsibly analyzed. Our citizens are pinning great hopes on the ideas of social restructuring proposed by the CPSU and linked with the activity of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

"Although the previous CPCZ leadership approved documents on the restructuring of society, their realization was inconsistent and went no further than verbal assurances of democratization and dialogue. They hoped that the far-reaching changes taking place in the socialist countries would bypass Czechoslovakia. They rejected fundamental criticism of Stalinist deformations in Czechoslovakia. A contemptuous attitude was taken toward restructuring.

"Consequently, the people lost hope that the party would really implement restructuring. Others took the initiative into their own hands.

"We are making a final, decisive break with the old concept of the leading role of one party, based on a monopoly of force and ideology," the draft says. "We are in favor of humane [gumannyy], democratic socialism. We are embarking on a path of dialogue with other political forces and movements. Our ideological platform is still that of Marxism-Leninism, but purged of its dogmatic accretions."

The draft platform proposes specific measures to enhance economic efficiency, create a socialist market, and build a rule-of-law state. We are in favor of a strong social policy, the draft says, that will primarily protect the interests of the family, pensioners, young people and other needy strata of the population. The draft contains measures to develop culture and morality and protect the environment.

Regional and district party conferences begin on 9 December. Communists will be discussing the draft platform and electing delegates to the extraordinary CPCZ congress planned for 20 December. Attitudes to the draft platform are by no means straightforward, even within the CPCZ itself. The "Democratic Forum of Communists" is developing its activity within the party. It already unites 50,000 CPCZ members, as well as representatives of young people and non-party people.

The "Rebirth" Club is also active: It consists of former CPCZ members, who have either left the party or were expelled on the basis of party investigations into their activity in the 1968-1969 period. The club's manifesto has been published in the newspaper RUDE PRAVO. The club advocates eliminating bureaucratic-edict state administration and wants to humanize the country's social structure. Despite their differences, the platforms of these movements coincide in many respects. All this has made it possible to begin a dialogue between parties and movements. However, political passions are becoming heated. Czechoslovakia's Communists are faced with the serious problem of reviving their party and overcoming the crisis in society.

Civic Forum To Respect Warsaw Pact Membership

PM0912180989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 3

[Own correspondent Ye. Chernykh dispatch under the general heading "Events as They Are"]

[Text] Prague—On the walls of houses and on billboards in Prague you can see Communist leaflets among all the others. "Dialogue with everyone! Dialogue on Socialism!" The other day Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) Central Committee, had a meeting with Vaclav Havel, one of the leaders of "Civic Forum." K. Urbanek said that all CPCZ activity under conditions of equal partnership with other parties will be geared to one aim: to ensuring that Czechoslovakia becomes a modern, prospering state as soon as possible. The CPCZ wants that state to be socialist. There has also been a meeting between a "Civic Forum" delegation led by V. Havel and members of the military. Representatives of the "Civic Forum" Coordination Council said: In view of the present military-political situation in Europe, we respect Czechoslovakia's membership in the Warsaw Pact. They expressed the hope that in the future the two military blocs in Europe will be dissolved.

Repression of CSSR, Hungary, Poland Condemned

OW1012094289 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Station commentator Mayorov commentary]

[Text] Dear friends, at a meeting in Moscow last week the leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, and the Soviet Union denounced the decision made by those five countries in 1968 to send troops into the CSSR. In its statement, the Soviet Government also termed the decision to send troops into that country a mistake. It may seem strange to some that events that occurred over 20 years ago should be mentioned at this time. Our station reporter Mayorov writes:

At a time when various countries of Eastern Europe are carrying out reforms to break with the past, the reexamination of history may seem strange. What is the reason for recalling history? This is due precisely because the process of pioneering a new thing is closely related to a tortuous and dramatic reassessment of the past. Just as there is no future without the past, there will be nor reforms without criticism of past mistakes, policy errors, and abnormalities.

The Soviet Union is in the midst of ridding itself of the bad influence of Stalin. Although he left the political arena a long time ago, his influence still remains. Through the efforts of eyewitnesses, historians, and journalists today, a full picture is being recreated of what happened in the Gulag Archipelago. Are these empty reminiscences? To think in this way amounts to living in accordance with the former distorted notions of socialism. We study what happened in the past precisely because we want to restore their original features. It is precisely on the basis of this point of view that we are dealing with the incidents that took place during Brezhnev's rule, including the five allied countries' decision to send troops into the CSSR in the 1960's.

It is bitter to realize that Soviet tanks in 1945 brought freedom to antifascist fighters in Prague, but that in 1968 it was not flowers that were thrown at the Soviet tanks. He who does not want tragedies repeated attaches importance to historical lessons. Stalinism was our tragedy. The suppression of the Prague Spring of 1968 was a tragedy for the Czechs and the Slovaks. The events of 1956 were a tragedy for the Hungarians, and those of the Katyn for the Poles. No, these are not empty reminiscences, nor a desire to rewrite some pages in the textbook of history, although what can be more important for the younger generation than historical truth?

The crux of the question lies in making a breakthrough in the minds of people and in reassessing the nature of relationships between the socialist countries and socialism as a whole.

This eye opening may be belated and difficult to achieve, but the road leading to truth has never been easy.

Polish Minister Criticizes Kohl Unification Plan

LD0812162489 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Warsaw December 8 TASS—"Failure to mention the problem of borders with neighbouring states, primarily with Poland, is a major shortcoming of Chancellor Helmut Kohl's 10-point programme submitted to the Bundestag on November 28," Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski stated on Thursday in the Polish Sejm that discussed the reunification of the two German states.

"Its provisions for the gradual rapprochement of both German states and their merging into a confederation gives rise to several questions," the minister said. "The Oder-Neisse border is a part of the present European pattern. It is an important factor in the process of Europe's unification, which is possible only within the established borders and in the absence of territorial disputes. Poland has no such disputes with anybody.

"The programme of German unification is unrealistic because it neglects the existing territorial situation. Now that unification is being put on the agenda of the day, Poland demands a clear-cut and unequivocal stand on the border problem.

"And one more fundamental question: How can the merging of the two German states into a single international-legal or even state organism be reconciled with mutual superpowers' strategic security, particularly in Europe, a region of immense importance for their relations. The programme does not answer this question, and without at least some agreement on this matter, it will remain impracticable," the minister stressed.

"The superpowers' strategic security in Europe is one of the political realities on the continent. The two German states cannot merge before major changes are achieved in the global strategies of the great powers. The West German chancellor's programme envisages substantial changes in the existing political, military and territorial system of Central Europe and the emergence of a new German power there. This is a major issue of world politics and not merely a bilateral German problem. It does not concern only one state—the FRG—and its policy.

The strategic security of the superpowers is ensured, on the one hand by the bilateral alliance of the USSR and the GDR and the latter's membership in the Warsaw Treaty, and, on the other, by West Germany's participation in NATO. History knows no precedents when a confederation was formed of members affiliated to different alliances and military organisations.

"Poland supports the idea of a united Europe and believes it must be implemented through the cooperation and integration of European states," Skubiszewski noted. "The changing relations between the two German states must keep in step with the efforts to unite and be abreast of their successes on a continental scale."

"Relations between the two German states cannot run ahead of these efforts and successes. The state unity of the German nation has therefore become the business of Europe as a whole and especially of their neighbours.

"Separate provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the entire process of cooperation, initiated by this document, assume particular importance in this light," the minister stressed.

Attacks on Soviet Monuments in Poland Deplored

PM1112090989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Shutkevich dispatch under the rubric "Warsaw on the Line": "Rampage Around Pedestals"]

[Text] Monuments are even more defenseless than children. It is only in literary variations on the theme of "The Stone Guest" that the knight commander steps down from his pedestal with a menacing step to punish the offender. In reality, monumental figures are so weak that they cannot even drive impertinent pigeons from their brow. They appear all the more defenseless before a crowd of several hundred people who have encircled the pedestals and are on the point of storming them.

It seems that war has been declared on monuments in Poland, although not on all, only on those which remind Poles of their neighbors in the east, of our joint revolutionary struggle, of the friendship between the two countries' peoples, which was strengthened in the clash with fascism, and of the spread of socialist ideas on Polish soil. The first "salvos" of this strange war were heard in Krakow at the beginning of this year, when the monument to the Soviet servicemen-liberators was chosen as the object of an attack. A letter from well-known Soviet cultural figures to representatives of the Polish intelligentsia regarded that sally as an act of vandalism, of wild and primitive thinking. True, the monument did not suffer physically: That time the salvos were still being fired with tubs of kefir...

The next strike was far more shattering: The monument to F. Dzerzhinskiy in the Polish capital was razed to the ground. It had been decided, based on a specious excuse, to dismantle the monument. "At 1000 hours on Friday a noose was placed over the revolutionary's head," PRZEGLAD TYGODNIOWY said, voluptuously describing the process. "The crane got going and the monument began to crack. The concrete man began falling apart from his head downward. Then his legs became detached, and his body began to twitch in the air... The crowd threw themselves on his remains, fighting over who would get the head, howling, clapping their hands, and performing physiological functions on the fragments." Honestly, it was difficult and uncomfortable to read such a thing. You cannot even understand which shows more primitive, bestial hatred—whether it is the cited newspaper episode or the violence against the monument. It is, of course, possible to have different attitudes toward the personality of "Iron Feliks," and it is possible to have doubts about the legality of the methods of the Extraordinary Commission, which he headed, and even to condemn it. But still people are obliged to observe the elementary decencies...

Next bottles containing an incendiary mixture were used. Last Wednesday they were thrown at the monument to V.I. Lenin in Nowa Huta. Shots shown on television in the evening conveyed the atmosphere of this battle: wild tongues of flame licking the base of the monument, the tinkling of slivers against stone, the crowd being pressed by the guardians of order... The instigators here, as during the previous disturbances near the monument reported in the Soviet press, were from the extremist wing of the so-called "Federation of Struggling Youth," which recently conferred upon itself the title "Alternative Society." As one of the moderate leaders of the "Federation of Struggling Youth" emphasized recently, as a result of its refusal to make any reasonable compromise this wing has "ended up outside active politics and still cannot find its place in society. This is why there is so much hatred within it." Its supporters essentially put an ultimatum to T. Mazowiecki's government, threatening street riots if the Lenin memorial in Nowa Huta was not demolished by the city authorities by 6 December. And, as we see, they kept their word. How does this monument disturb them so? The "Alternative Society's" supporters certainly do not conceal their intentions: Because it is "a symbol of the Soviet system" which was imposed on Poland by force.

The participants in the protracted "siege" of the monument prefer not to think about the feelings which it arouses in citizens of the neighboring state, whose founder was V.I. Lenin. However, serious politicians in Poland cannot fail to think about this. Unfortunately, neither persuasion by Minister A. Hall nor a statement by L. Walesa, who described such actions as a political provocation, cooled the flushed extremists. True, they have not yet succeeded in getting their way. The militia forces have instilled relative order in the city. But will this last long? Members of extremist groupings are already threatening to repeat the disturbances in a few days' time—13 December, the next anniversary of the proclamation of martial law in the country in 1981—and to organize their "own revolution" by the monument...

What can one say in this regard? It does not take great courage to declare war on monuments. Those who declared war on palaces had to show real courage. And if only for this reason alone, despite any mistakes made by them or ascribed to them, they deserve far greater respect than today's "struggling youth," who are now trying to knock them off their pedestals.

Poland's Siwicki Views Impact of Changes on Army

PM1112120589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Army General F. Siwicki, member of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee Politburo and Polish minister of national defense, by Captain M. Zheglov: "Polish Army Against Background of Changes"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] [Zheglov] Comrade Minister, this is your first visit to the Soviet Union as a member of the broad coalition government. How has the nature of your activity changed within the new Cabinet?

[Siwicki] Today the Polish Government includes four ministers who are members of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR]. I have the honor of fulfilling within it, as in the former one, the functions of minister of national defense. My duties in this government have not changed, since the Polish Army is still a force of the whole people and fulfills its duty proceeding from the basic requirements of the Constitution. Of course, being a member of the broad coalition government, I seek to fulfill as well as possible the tasks facing us. And at present these are connected, above all, with the changing structure of our armed forces and with their functioning under conditions of limited economic opportunities. This requires an in-depth analysis of all measures, so as to secure qualitative results without harming defense capability.

[Zheglov] There are certain circles in the West which do not conceal their hopes that the processes occurring today in the European socialist countries will lead, in the final analysis, almost to the collapse of the Warsaw Pact Organization. What is the Polish Government's opinion on this question?

[Siwicki] I believe that such statements are totally groundless. It is a question, rather, of unrealistic wishes on the part of these political forces and groups. For everything that we have achieved—improved interstate relations, the ensuring of stability, the strengthening of peace—is accounted for by the equilibrium that still exists between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Every sober-minded politician understands this fact. We are in favor of the Warsaw Pact's continued existence, and we will fulfill our obligations as an ally within it.

[Zheglov] In connection with the PZPR's changing role in the life of Polish society, how do you see the organization of political work in the Polish Army?

[Siwicki] I have already issued an order to rename the Main Political Directorate the Political Education Directorate. Political organs are changing not only their names but also their structure, since they will no longer perform party political work. Educational functions alone remain. At the same time the programs of servicemen's instruction are being improved, with the emphasis on concepts such as patriotism, civic duty, and traditions. It should be emphasized that deputy commanders for educational work will have the same rights as other deputies.

[Zheglov] But the majority of officers are PZPR members. How will party work be carried on among them?

[Siwicki] We are working out these questions. Officers who are PZPR members will either form their own primary organizations in units or join party organizations at their place of residence. There will be no permanent secretaries of PZPR organizations in units. Certain radically-minded politicians, including PZPR members, advocate eliminating party influence in the army altogether. But we will be able to determine our position on these questions finally after the 11th party congress. Perhaps the congress will find other solutions and define new structures and the substance of party work in the army.

[Zheglov] It can be seen from Polish mass media reports that pacifist and, regrettable though it may be, anti-army sentiments have become widespread among a section of Polish young people. How does the Ministry of Defense react to these processes?

[Siwicki] Pacifist sentiments exist in many countries. An analysis of the situation shows that in our country they are preached by small groups of the population. Some of them express extremist views, which naturally does not serve the cause of young people's civic education. We, of course, hold the viewpoint that today, when pluralism of opinions has been recognized, everyone can express his own political, moral, and other views. Therefore, pacifist sentiments, if they proceed from moral and ethical considerations, should be acknowledged and taken into account. Proceeding from this, our laws grant young people the opportunity to fulfill their civic duty in the form of alternative service. This lasts 50 percent longer than ordinary military service. Last year 450 of the 700 people who requested it and whose arguments were deemed valid took advantage of this right. So you can see for yourself how small the percentage of refuseniks is among the draft contingent. This does not affect our defensive potential, but it is of great significance for shaping many people's sentiments. I will tell you that the majority of our young people do not share pacifist views, although, as statistics show, the number of adherents to the ideas of pacificism is growing, albeit very slowly.

[Zheglov] What about anti-army sentiments?

[Siwicki] We do not have any, quite definitely. There are individuals who try to make use of certain negative aspects of the army to undermine its prestige. This pains us military people. For our part we endeavor in every instance to get to the bottom of a question that has been raised, but on the other hand we seek not to hide our shortcomings. We are open to criticism because we believe that even an army as good as the Polish Army has its own certain shortcomings. They are accounted for by the actions of specific people, not by the organization of military service as a whole. At the same time, everything must be done to show the really difficult work of servicemen and their contribution to the cause of ensuring peace and the people's quiet life. It must be emphasized that sociological studies, which we have been conducting for many years now, show that the Polish Army always holds one of the first places among public and state institutions in terms of its prestige. We will do everything to continue to maintain this position.

[Zheglov] The topic I would like to touch upon pains the peoples of our countries. It is a question of individual manifestations of anti-Sovietism in Poland—in particular, of acts of vandalism against the graves of Soviet servicemen who fell while liberating Polish soil. Have these negative phenomena gone far? What is the attitude of Polish Army servicemen toward them?

[Siwicki] The majority of Poles have a negative perception of all these political excesses. These are all actions by extremist groups and organizations which, in my view, display political immaturity. They undoubtedly undermine Poland's prestige and the position of the broad coalition government. They violate the fundamentals of our country's policy aimed at strengthening cooperation with the Soviet Union, and we servicemen, like the majority of our people, regard these actions as unacceptable. We receive many letters from veterans and young people. We print them in our military newspaper ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI and try to demonstrate that such extremist adventures hinder the development of democracy in Poland. In addition, militia forces are also waging the struggle against extremists. I believe that with the passage of time the members of extremist groups will realize that they are isolated and will abandon their actions.

Personnel Changes at BCP Plenum; Mladenov Speaks

PM1112105389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "At the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Sofia, 9 Dec—A Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee plenum was held here Friday to discuss organizational issues.

P. Mladenov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee, read out requests from a number of members of leading party bodies to be released from their duties. He stressed that the new, dynamic situation in the country and the political course now being followed by the party require the bold, far-reaching renewal of BCP cadres. This is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that the Communist Party continues to be the authoritative, vanguard political force that can successfully consolidate all society in the name of restructuring, socialism, and the good of the people.

The Central Committee, the speaker continued, was inclined to see off the former BCP leader with expressions of gratitude, albeit restrained. However, the people and the party have decisively changed this appraisal. Ordinary Communists and citizens of Bulgaria have raised the question—with total justification—of T. Zhivkov's personal guilt and responsibility for the deformations of the past period and the situation in which the country now finds itself.

P. Mladenov touched on the proposal submitted for the plenum's discussion of making A. Lilov a member of the Central Committee, pointing out that this party figure had actually been expelled from the Politburo and the Central Committee—and for no trivial reason. The reason for his expulsion was that he had voiced criticism regarding the personality cult in Bulgaria. It was also proposed to make R. Grigorov a member of the Central Committee. Previously a member of the BCP Central Committee, he had spoken out openly against some voluntarist theories and actions of the former general secretary.

The plenum satisfied the requests of I. Panev, Y. Yotov, and P. Kubadinski that they be released from their duties as members of the BCP Central Committee Politburo; N. Papazov as member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee;

and G. Yordanov and G. Stoichkov as candidate members of the BCP Central Committee Politburo. It expressed its appreciation to them for their work in the party. The plenum proposed that the National Assembly satisfy the requests of G. Yordanov and G. Stoichkov that they be released from their duties as deputy chairmen of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers. T. Zhivkov was expelled from the BCP Central Committee along with a number of other members of this leading party body.

By decision of the plenum, A. Lilov and R. Grigorov were co-opted onto the Central Committee.

The plenum elected A. Lilov as member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee; B. Belchev as member of the Politburo; I. Ivanov and P. Danev as candidate members of the Politburo; and D. Uzunov as secretary of the BCP Central Committee.

The decision made when releasing T. Zhivkov from his duties as general secretary of the BCP Central Committee to express appreciation to him for his work was canceled.

Bulgarian 'Union of Democratic Forces' Formed

LD0812140289 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Sofia December 8 TASS—The first meeting of the Union of Democratic Forces of Bulgaria was held here on Thursday.

It was formed by a number of independent democratic organisations, associations and movements, the BTA news agency reported.

The union's aim is to pool and coordinate efforts to accelerate democratisation in the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the report said. The new organisation includes the Independent Human Rights Society, the Ecoglasnost Association, the Independent Podkrepa Labour Federation, the Committee for the Protection of Religious Rights, Freedom of Conscience and Spiritual Values, as well as a number of other organisations.

A statement, issued after the meeting, BTA reported, demands the establishment of a civil society, political pluralism and multiparty system, a rule-of-law state and market economy.

Among specific demands are recognition of the equality of all forms of property, new labour and social legislation to guarantee the working people's right to independent trade unions and strikes, and a new draft constitution.

National legislation must be geared to the universal declaration of human rights and the documents passed in the coures of the Helsinki process. There should be a new approach to ethnic and religious minorities.

The founders say that the union of Bulgaria's democratic forces is open to all independent associations and political groups ready to promote the platform by peaceful and legitimate means.

The union will be headed by a coordination council with philosopher Zhelu Zhelev as chairman.

A ceremony to present a petition from the Committee for the Protection of Religious Rights, Freedom of Conscience and Spiritual Values was held at Bulgaria's People's Assembly on Thursday. The petition demands democratic changes in the 1947 law on faith. It demands that Christmas and Easter should be official holidays again.

The ceremony was preceded by a mass religious procession in downtown Sofia. People applauded committee chairman, Clergyman Christopher Sybev when he said that the church had helped preserve the Bulgarian people during times of trial.

'No Alternative' to 'Deep' Reform in E. Europe

LD0812134389 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Georgiy Grammatchikov commentary]

[Text] Sometimes the paradoxical idea enters my mind that the former leaders of the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria intentionally provoke the outburst of public protests. That is not true, of course, but just think what the former Czechoslovak authorities managed to achieve in just 1 day, the fatal day of 17 November when at their orders the police attacked the peaceful students' demonstration in Prague. No dissidents could have achieved as much in years.

And what about some party functionaries in the German Democratic Republic? As if trying to challenge the public, they shamelessly embezzled government property. In Bulgaria, public funds were misused. Even the instinct of self-preservation did not prompt them that the situation when they can do anything and remain unpunished cannot last forever.

This is not just a matter of corruption, though it is corruption that arouses the greatest indignation of the public. What was more important was the loyalty of the party and state apparatus to outdated dogmas and abstract patterns, the inability to accept the challenge of the time and live according to general human laws. Now the very existence of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is in question. In Czechoslovakia the Communist Party is giving up one position after another in the government and in the provinces. On the eve of special party congresses the question arises whether communists will be able to make a sober-minded evaluation of the situation and live up to the tasks put forward by time; and finally, find a reasonable and deserving compromise with other parties and public movements.

Having received an impetus from perestroyka in the Soviet Union, the express of renewal in socialist countries is picking up speed. It has pulled out of the blind alley of the Stalinist model of socialism. Now it is important not to enter other blind alleys of anarchy, chaos, and economic disintegration. It is precisely there that the ultimatums and threats sometimes resorted to by the opposition can lead to. It would be a simplification to say that all Soviet people sympathize with the changes in Eastern Europe. The spectrum of opinions about the developments is sufficiently wide—from approval: good for you; to fear: you've gone too far. There is one more thing that must be stressed.

The news from Prague, Berlin, Budapest, Warsaw, and Sofia creates a special impression against the background of the stormy developments in the Soviet Union itself—the election campaign, the parliamentary debates on new laws, economic difficulties, and dramatic interethnic conflict. Oleg Bogomolov, a prominent expert on socialist countries, has said that the general and unavoidable nature of changes in Eastern Europe is a clear sign that we don't have another alternative than deep and radical reforms, no matter how the advocates of the past might resist.

Mass Nature of E. Europe Events Stressed

PM1112101389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Manki Ponomarev commentary under "International Observer Replies to Reader" rubric: "Let History Decide"]

[Text] In his agitated letter to the editorial office, I. Yerokhin, a veteran of the Great Patriotic War from Volzhskiy City, asks:

"For a long time the situation in the European socialist countries, with the possible exception of Poland, was calm and stable. The economy was developing, people had enough to eat, they had clothes and shoes. Suddenly, there is such a flood of changes that it is difficult to take it all in. How did all this come about? And why are we watching all this indifferently, as it were. Why are we not exerting our influence on the processes that are taking place there in order to prevent the loss of the gains of socialism?"

Thinking about the answer to your letter, Ivan Vasilevich, I could not but recall the many events I have witnessed over the years, and, being a journalist, which I frequently reported in detail, furnishing assessments. I described, for instance, what a boon the "antifascist defensive bulwark" was for the working people of the GDR. I gave an account of the assistance rendered to the peoples of Czecholsovakia by the servicemen of five Warsaw Pact countries. I reported how the Polish Army, fulfilling the will of the party of the working class, barred the road to the extremists from "Solidarity." I wrote all this not just out of a sense of duty but out of conviction, out of a sincere belief—shared by the overwhelming majority of Soviet people, incidentally—that it was necessary to act precisely in this way.

Compared with today, however, everything looked different in those days. Everything was marked by acute military confrontation, ideological intolerance, and irreconcilability between the two worlds wherein everyone who was not on our side was regarded as an enemy, when the conviction that we were right, that the road we had chosen was the only correct one, was recognized as the incontrovertible, absolute truth. The need to make realistic assessments and choose realistic approaches, on the other hand, was not something self-evident, especially if the events were interlaced in a most peculiar and contradictory manner.

Why do I mention all this in such detail today? Because not just for you personally but also for most other people, including myself, recent events in European socialist countries have come as a shock and a moment of truth. However, the importance of such moments lies precisely in the fact that they furnish food for thought and help us work out where we are, where we stand, and where we are going.

And so what does the analysis of the situation that has taken shape in a number of countries in Eastern Europe reveal? I do not claim that what I am about to say will be either incontrovertible or exhaustive, but there are a number of features that simply command attention.

Above all, it is the fact that the events taking place in the European socialist coutries are by no means an isolated phenomenon that affects only them. They are most closely bound up with perestroyka in the Soviet Union, and in general with the changes taking place in the world today. We know what is happening in our country from our own day-to-day experience. And in the West? There, too, the changes are striking. A departure from military confrontation is taking shape, ways of cooperation with the socialist world are being investigated. A process of economic integration and coordination is under way in Western Europe and, what is more, it is taking place on the basis of expansion of ties rather than isolation. I will cite only one very noteworthy example: A few days ago in Brussels a draft agreement was coordinated on trade and cooperation between the "Common Market" and the USSR which makes provision for the deep involvement of both sides in world economic ties. Even quite recently this would have appeared simply unthinkable—the sides either ignored each other, or their relations were hampered by all kind of embargoes and other bans that originated mainly in the West.

The coincidence of the changes in the East with the changes in the West is not fortuitous. It testifies to their objective character, to mutual ties and interdependence in our countradictory world which, however, as the new political thinking has shown, is an integral world. In conditions of the emerging transition from the "cold war" age to a peaceful age, radical changes are inevitable, since the former rigid structures and approaches merely hamper such a transition to a new era, an era in which all countries and the whole of mankind have an interest.

Another distinctive feature of the changes taking place in Eastern Europe is their popular character, the participation in them of the broadest masses of the people. It is enough to recall the television pictures showing hundreds of thousands of people demonstrating in the streets of Berlin, Prague, and Sofia... The very fact that the demands for change came not from individual social strata but the broad masses ensured the speed and decisiveness of the transformations.

And finally, the characteristic feature of the events in European socialist countries is their similarity, regardless of the differences that exist from country to country. This similarity, this commonality are the result of the fact that the bureaucratic administrative-edict system and the excessive centralization and cumbersome and often unrealistic nature of planning have clashed irreconcilably with the needs of further development. The vanguard role of the ruling parties has been shaken, their leadership has become divorced from the masses, and it has failed to take account of pressing needs for the renewal of the life of society. This led to stagnation, increasingly serious difficulties, and laggardness behind the progressive trends in the world. And what is more, this also applies to countries which until recently were considered to be doing well. It has now emerged that the GDR, whose former leaders did not agree with our perestroyka and did not recognize it, is up to its eyes in debt. The republic's external debt totals $10 billion, and the internal debt totals 120 billion marks.

In all the states where decisive changes are taking place these changes are being accompanied by a replacement of the party and state leadership and even by an elimination from their constitutions of the clause on the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist parties. And in some countries—the GDR, for instance—the bankrupt leaders have even been expelled from the party and criminal proceedings instituted against them.

Even this cursory and by no means full analysis seems to me to hold the essence of the answer to your question, Ivan Vasilevich: How should we react to what is happening? Since these events are objective, since they have not sprung from someone's good or ill will but have been engendered by life itself, since they are deeply popular and democratic in nature and are aimed at the renewal of socialism, at cleansing it of the methods of administrative edict and regimentation, toward a focus on man, his needs, aspirations, and interests, they must be regarded as progressive. As is often the case with mass movements, all manner of forces join up with them, and sometimes overtly hostile elements intent on fishing in life's troubled waters jump onto the bandwagon. However, they do not set the course. It is society's healthy forces which consolidate themselves and set the course, despite the fact that there are innumerable difficulties and problems in their path.

Ultimately, history will decide. However, we have every reason to believe that this development is in keeping with the needs of the times and of the masses of people, and that our attitude toward it must be positive. There must be no lecturing from on high, not to mention the crude interference of which we were guilty during the years of the cult and stagnation, but rather benevolent support for positive changes, close political cooperation, improvement of economic, cultural, and spiritual ties, and examples of the resolute elimination of everything that is obsolete and hampers progress. This, clearly, is the most correct path, and it is the path the Soviet Union is following in the present conditions. It is obviously not a question of the loss of the gains of socialism but of giving socialism a new, humane, human look and giving it back its true ideals.

West Europe

Mitterrand Says Support of Gorbachev 'Essential'

LD1112093189 Moscow TASS in English 0816 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Paris December 11 TASS—By TASS correspondent Sergey Batyrev:

"We have a very good mutual understanding with the Soviet Union. There are grounds for trust. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev devotes special attention to France," French President Francois Mitterrand said in an interview with a group of French journalists on Sunday.

"He remembers that for centuries Russia and France acted as elements of equilibrium in the periods of major historical events," Mitterrand said in the interview broadcast by the Antenne-2 television network and the Europe-1 radio station.

Speaking of the problems of international politics, the French president focused on processes now taking place in socialist countries and on relations with the Soviet Union and East European countries.

He favoured the development of economic cooperation between Western Europe in general and France in particular and the Soviet Union, emphasising that the USSR should be viewed as a partner and not as opponent in the economic field.

Responding to journalists' request to express his opinion on developments in the Soviet Union, Mitterrand said: "During the meeting in Kiev the Soviet president produced a still more confident and calm impression upon me than during our previous meeting in Paris in July this year.

"He took certain decisions and, consequently, he considered their consequences. The historic role of Gorbachev should be emphasised. It is essential to support him. His actions underlie all corrent processes. He let them begin and he works more than anyone else to develop them."

The French president focused on matters connected with the future of the two German states.

Recalling opinions expressed by the leaders of 12 EC countries during the European Council's recently concluded session in Strasbourg, the documents of which mention a "reunification of the German people," Mitterrand specially emphasised that it may only involve a peaceful and democratic process.

He spoke of a process under which "all principles defined by the Final Act of the Helsinki conference would be respected (the Final Act envisages the inviolability of borders).

"The process would take place within the context of dialogue and cooperation between East and West and the European integration perspective."

In Strasbourg it was stated that "respect for the borders is the major principle and that all these processes may not run counter to the interests of Europe," Mitterrand said.

Touching upon disarmament issues, the French president said that France would join disarmament talks only after the Soviet Union and the United States move much further in this field and attain "a level that would no longer pose a threat."

"In the meantime" he said, "I do not intend to disarm France, which has far less of a potential than the two other countries."

French Business Delegation Visits, Meets Leaders

Received by Deputy Premier Voronin

PM0812144789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general headline: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received a delegation of French businessmen headed by F. Perigot, president of the National Council of French Employers, 7 December in the Kremlin.

Talks With Ryzhkov

PM1112121989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting With Representatives of French Business World"]

[Text] On 8 December N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Francois Perigot, president of the National Council of French Employers, and M. Freyche and P. Bellon, vice presidents of the council, who are currently in Moscow as part of a French business circles' delegation.

During the conversation that took place it was noted that the arrival in the Soviet Union of such a widely representative delegation is in line with the dynamic development of Soviet-French relations at the current stage, which received a new boost as a result of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand in Kiev. The general improvement of the international atmosphere, the departure from the stereotypes of the "cold war" in states' policy, stepped up political dialogue, and also the radical restructuring of foreign economic ties in the Soviet Union—all this is creating qualitatively new conditions for large-scale cooperation between the USSR and France. In this context the sides emphasized that the development of new forms of cooperation is a key element of efforts to enhance the effectiveness of Soviet-French trade, economic, scientific, technical, and other ties.

Characterizing, at F. Perigot's request, the current stage of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, N.I. Ryzhkov noted that despite serious difficulties in the country's socioeconomic life, a sound basis is consistently being laid at the moment for switching the national economy to new management conditions, enhancing its efficiency and competitiveness, and focusing on the satisfaction of society's social needs.

F. Perigot rated highly the Soviet-French accords achieved recently in a number of cooperation spheres, which was facilitated by the strengthening of the contract and legal basis of bilateral collaboration in the business sphere. The main thing now is to concentrate efforts on the practical implementation of these accords. The visit to Moscow by the delegation of French industrialists is one of the important stages of this work and a concrete expression of the French business world's interest in expanding economic cooperation between our two countries on the basis of broad identity of interests and mutual trust.

Topical questions of international economic relations, the active involvement of the Soviet Union in world economic ties, the establishment of constructive contacts with existing European and international economic structures, and the strengthening of the economic foundations of the future common European home were also touched upon.

Taking part in the conversation were L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Ya.P. Ryabov, USSR ambassador to France; V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry Presidium; and also J.M. Merillon, French ambassador to the USSR.

Discuss Joint Ventures

LD0912111289 Moscow TASS in English 2034 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—Aspects of joint ventures were in the focus of attention of the meeting here today between French businesspeople and Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev.

The leaders of forty French firms, who arrived in Moscow on Wednesday led by President of the National Council of French Entrepreneurs Francois Perigot, had already met government officials and visited foreign economic associations.

During their conversation with Katushev, they expressed interest in the development of new forms of cooperation and noted the complications some of them had encountered in their attempts to adjust relations.

Responding to questions of French entrepreneurs, Katushev said that joint ventures were being given priority as a form of foreign economic relations of Soviet enterprises. Traditional forms of relations were also given their fair share of attention. For example, major shipments of consumer goods were recently purchased in other countries. As for funding joint projects, the problem is treated on an individual basis. Credits from Soviet and foreign banks are possible. The repatriation of foreign partners' profits is best done at the expense of currency receipts for exports, but other, more complex variants, including multilateral operations, are also possible, the Soviet minister said.

One way is the creation of consortiums of foreign, including French, firms. Consortiums that are now being established will handle the redistribution of currency receipts from joint ventures on Soviet territory among their members.

French entrepreneurs have so far shown less activity in establishing joint enterprises in the Soviet Union than their counterparts from West Germany, Finland, the United States and Italy.

However, today's meeting was told that negotiations are nearing completion on a variety of projects in the fields of metallurgy, machine building, chemical and furniture making industries, as well as in the area of trade.

France's Dumas on EC Discussion of East Europe

LD0912134189 Moscow TASS in English 1146 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Strasbourg December 9 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Viktor Khrekov and Aleksander Krivykh:

The European Community leaders discussed on the first day of their meeting here a number of important issues, including relations with East European states, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas told TASS.

He said Western Europe had managed to define its policy towards changes in Europe. In particular, specific decisions were taken to set up a European Development Bank to Aid Eastern Europe and a scheme to train management personnel.

Dumas declared that those decisions were approved unanimously and work will have to be started to implement them.

At a news briefing on Friday [8 December] night Dumas said that the EC member countries welcomed the Soviet leadership's policy of openness and reform, which exerted strong influence on the processes of democratisation in Eastern Europe. One wants to hope that reforms would continue along with the East-West dialogue. The minister said that the EC-USSR agreement on cooperation, due to be signed before the end of the current year, is of great practical interest to West Europeans. He also pointed out that changes in Europe should take place in a "peaceful and democratic" atmosphere.

Dumas said in conclusion that foreign ministers of the Common Market countries discussed at the Strasbourg meeting some other international issues, including the Lebanese crisis and the situation in Latin America and Southern Africa.

Genscher Cited on German Issue, Soviet Role

LD1112081889 Moscow TASS in English 0724 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Bonn December 11 TASS—The Soviet Union's policy and new thinking opened the way for historic changes in East-European countries, stated West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

An atmosphere of stability on the continent is essential for the success of the process, he pointed out in a speech in Saarbruecken at the ceremony of the presentation of the Richard Becker medal.

"Neither now nor in the future will the Federal Republic make use in any way of the difficulties of the transitional period in socialist countries to gain unilateral advantages," he said.

"We know that the processes taking place in Eastern Europe cannot be viewed separately because they are interconnected. The stable situation in the German Democratic Republic acquires special importance in this connection.

"A solution to the 'German issue' cannot be a vital cause to the Germans alone. In this difficult period special responsibility for the maintenance of stability on the continent rests with both the citizens of the FRG and the GDR," Genscher said.

"The Helsinki accords constitute a good basis for the development of the changing but at the same time stable Europe. They may serve as a reliable compass indicating ways for further headway.

"The proposal by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to convene a Helsinki-2 conference in 1990 acquires special importance in this connection.

"The holding of a CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] conference at summit level will open up new prospects and lend dynamism to the Helsinki process. This is why we support this proposal," Genscher emphasised.

Silayev Views FRG Visit, Economic Ties

LD0612180889 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 6 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 6 TASS—"Only a few out of the 152 joint Soviet-West German enterprises, registered at the USSR Ministry of Finance, produce machinery and equipment. This is why Soviet and West German partners are now exploring the possibility of launching large-scale engineering ventures," Ivan Silayev, Soviet deputy premier and chairman of the Machine-Building Bureau under the USSR Council of Ministers, told TASS.

Silayev headed a Soviet delegation to the recent meeting in the FRG of co-chairmen of the Soviet-West German Intergovernmental Commission for Trade, Economy and Scientific and Technical Cooperation.

Silayev said that the commission had studied carefully the implementation of major Soviet-West German economic agreements signed during Helmut Kohl's visit to the USSR in October 1988 and Mikhail Gorbachev's stay in the FRG in July 1989.

It was noted, specifically, that the agreement to train Soviet specialists in West German industry was being implemented ahead of schedule. Both sides expressed their desire to ratify next year the agreement on mutual protection of investments. Sites were selected and datelines fixed for the construction of economic centres in the USSR and the FRG. They will be built within 30 months from now in Moscow and Dusseldorf.

"However," Ivan Silayev noted, "not everything is smooth in Soviet-West German cooperation. There are problems linked with the implementation of joint plans in space engineering, aviation, high-frequency television and electronics. They are caused by Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] restrictions. During talks with the heads of major West German concerns, representatives of West German business circles were practically unanimous that Cocom should not interfere in Soviet-West German economic cooperation. The visit abounded in meetings with West German partners at their respective enterprises. They were marked by constructiveness and yielded many concrete ideas in such areas of cooperation as ecology, electrical engineering, instrument-making, automobile building and production of equipment for the social sphere.

West German business circles are beginning to show interest in relations with enterprises of the Soviet defence complex going over to the production of consumer goods. Silayev said that a Soviet Conversion-90 exhibition would open in Munich in April 1990. The Soviet deputy premier noted that the visit was clouded by the tragic death of Alfred Herrhausen, president of the Deutsche Bank, who was a reliable trade partner of the Soviet Union. Silayev expressed the conviction that the bank's leadership would continue the traditions of active cooperation with the Soviet Union initiated by this outstanding businessman.

FRG Banker Sees Difficulties Facing Perestroyka

PM0712125589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with J. Sengera, member of the Westdeutsche Landesbank Board, by own correspondent B. Lysenko: "There Is No Alternative to Perestroyka"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] West Germany's North Rhine-Westphalia state bank, the "Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale," plays an important part in the process of the progressive development of USSR-FRG trade and economic links. Your IZVESTIYA correspondent met with Juergen Sengera, a member of the Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale board, who was in Moscow attending the North-Rhine Westphalia information days. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Does the development of USSR-FRG trade and economic relations have any obvious significance for the bank?

[Sengera] Yes, it does have great significance, because North Rhine-Westphalia accounts for between 35 and 40 percent of the FRG's foreign trade turnover with the USSR. Our firms' activity is particularly important in the further development of business cooperation. A firm that signs a contract with a Soviet partner inevitably applies to the bank. Therefore, relations between the bank and the USSR depend on the activeness of trade links between West German firms and their Soviet partners. Hence, the importance of measures such as the information days or the participation of the land's firms in industrial exhibitions in the USSR.

[Correspondent] What is hindering the activation of these relations?

[Sengera] Certain negative phenomena in the USSR, such as, for instance, the miners' strikes, carry a certain risk for our economic links with the USSR. The process of restructuring and democratization of the economy in the Soviet Union will evidently continue to cause temporary situations of relative instability, and business people in the West will have to take this into account.

We cannot yet fully envisage how the process of decentralizing the economy on a regional level will proceed. We are standing at the beginning of the road and making our first attempts in investigating the effect of these problems on our relations.

In addition, on a practical level it is difficult for us to find new partners in the current conditions (replacing our traditional foreign trade associations). Moreover, they are not all based in Moscow any longer. We will evidently come up against this problem for another year or two, until we establish regular contacts. Our new partners from the USSR regional economic and trade organizations do not possess sufficient experience, or, above all, sufficient knowledge.

But I particularly want to stress the fact that despite these problems I am not calling for a return to the old structures. I am convinced that there is no alternative to perestroyka.

W. Berlin Mayor Urges 'Sensible' E. Europe Policy

PM1112113589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Korolev dispatch: "West Berlin: Call for Sensible Policy"]

[Text] Debate at the latest sitting of the West Berlin Senat centered again on problems associated with the processes now occurring in the GDR. Addressing the sitting, Governing Mayor W. Momper noted that "there is no need to think in old terms and to triumphantly proclaim the victory of capitalism over socialism" in connection with the transformations in East European countries.

He called on the West for a sensible policy which would guide development in Europe along peaceful and stable tracks. Now, he said, the time is more appropriate "to wave a European rather than a German flag." Those who are celebrating victory today would encounter their own problems tomorrow: from unemployment and disregard for socially deprived strata of the population to the state of the economy.

W. Momper also declared that the West must "learn the peaceful implementation of reform and resolute actions from the GDR. Reforms in our own country are not a gift from heaven either. A struggle for social progress must also be waged in the West."

W. Berlin Socialist Unity Party May Disband

PM1112104789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch: "For the Sake of a New Beginning"]

[Text] West Berlin, 9 Dec—At its extraordinary session last Thursday, the board of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin proposed to recommend to the party congress that the party be disbanded.

Explaining this decision, members of the board pointed out that the party's name underlines its particular closeness to the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED], which is now experiencing a serious crisis and bears the responsibility for the deformation of socialism in the GDR.

The Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin's material difficulties have also contributed to the situation which, in the board's opinion, makes it necessary to disband the party. The Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin board urges all West Berlin communists to support this initiative. Its aim, the party leadership believes, is to promote "the rebirth of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice in the city."

The board's proposal will be considered at the extraordinary party congress in January next year.

W. Europe Wants Review of Cocom Export Curbs

PM1112083789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "Is it Time for Restrictions?"]

[Text] Paris—In recent weeks the West European capitals have been increasingly vigorously advocating a substantial reexamination of the Coordinating Committee for Controls on Exports to Socialist Countries (Cocom) restrictions, which today remain an obstruction to the development of cooperation between East and West.

A report by the Western European Union [WEU] Scientific and Technical and Aerospace Committee published recently assessed Cocom as a survival of Western policy in the "cold war" era. Its norms and rules, the document stresses, must be modified.

Even recently such a recommendation seemed unthinkable. It comes from an organization which deals primarily with military questions and which is often called by journalists "NATO's European pillar." No, the winds of change blowing from the East have by no means eroded this pillar, but to a significant degree they have dispersed distrust and changed the world situation.

But let us return to the report.

After the G. Bush administration came to power, the West Europeans, the authors of this document note, started to put pressure on the U.S. Government to produce a new policy on the processes taking place in the Soviet Union and consequently a more flexible approach to exporting the latest technology.

In response the Americans expressed concern at the "deterioration of the Cocom system" and told the allies to tighten control of deliveries of goods to the socialist countries. Even today the United States, the WEU report says, dictates its conditions and, because the rule of consensus operates in Cocom, can always resort to a veto. So in some instances West Europeans, when concluding agreements with the Soviet Union, are refusing to present them for Cocom's approval. But on the whole, attempts by the FRG, Britain, France, and other countries to get any kind of shift by the United States on questions of export controls have still not been successful.

Cocom's activity often does not produce the desired effect but, on the contrary, boomerangs on the West. So, for example, the report indicates, on account of the various bans from 1981 through 1986 the United States lost orders worth approximately $9.3 billion and West Europe lost orders worth $4 billion.

The West also sustained significant losses, the WEU document says, because Cocom prevented the creation of joint ventures with the Soviet Union in such spheres as machine building, electronics, metallurgy, computer technology, printing, and others. It also blocked many Soviet proposals on cooperation in the sphere of telecommunications, biotechnology, information technology, combating environmental pollution and even... restoring works of art.

Assessing Cocom's activity very critically, the authors of the report nonetheless maintain that its very existence is still justified. And the list of banned goods, in West European opinion, is too long and ineffective.

As most West European countries believe, in the immediate future Cocom must radically review its policy, taking into account the new realities, for in present conditions it has become an anachronism and the main barrier on the path of developing normal relations between East and West.

Transfer of U.S. B-52's to UK Criticized

90UI0185A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 5 Dec 89 p 3

[Report by Petr Parkhitko: "The 'Coincidences' Are Not by Chance"]

[Text] The London DAILY TELEGRAPH has reported that Great Britain has given its agreement for the deployment of nuclear-capable American B-52 strategic bombers on its territory. According to that newspaper, they will be redeployed next year to take part in NATO military maneuvers and deployed at the Fairford Airbase in Gloucestershire.

This is not the first time that aircraft of the U.S. Strategic Air Command have been deployed in the British Isles to take part in maneuvers. However, this redeployment of the B-52 bombers is notable because it has coincided with reports that the U.S. Strategic Air Command plans to extend the presence of its forces in Western Europe, first and foremost at bases in Great Britain. Another "coincidence" is also typical. The reports of the redeployment of American aircraft to England started to appear following last month's meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Portugal. However, a great deal becomes clear when we recall that the British Defense Secretary Tom King stated at that time that London "is considering various plans in light of the changes that have taken place since the conclusion of the INF Treaty."

True, Great Britain's present defense secretary has been trying to give the plans to redeploy B-52 aircraft in the British Isles the semblance of a regular and insignificant event. A defense spokesman, in particular, emphasized that this step in no way signifies "any general reorganization of U.S. air forces in Europe in light of the INF Treaty now signed."

However, the plans drawn up in Washington and London do not in any way testify to a growing love of peace. Thus, for example, neither side has removed from the agenda the possibility of deploying the nuclear-capable F-15 Eagle fighter-bomber in the British Isles. In the words of that same DAILY TELEGRAPH, it "is now being studied in Washington." So yet another "coincidence" of positions and views by the two NATO partners—a "coincidence" fraught with a threat to the security of the Europeans—has not been excluded.

News Conference on Science Ties With Italy

PM0712161989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Universal Laboratory"]

[Text] Rome, 6 Dec—Science without any secrets or borders, open to each and every one. This is still a dream, but it is gradually acquiring specific content. An example of this is offered by Soviet-Italian cooperation within the framework of the "Universal Laboratory" international scientific organization. Its prospects were the topic of conversation at a press conference in Rome attended by famous Italian physicist A. Zichichi, leader of the annual international seminar of physicists in the Sicilian town of Erice, and K.V. Frolov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Journalists were told of 32 projects on which joint work either is being or will be done by Soviet and Italian scientists and specialists.

Plans for Soviet-Italian scientific cooperation also include joint exploration of outer space and of Mars in particular. Very successful work is being done on the "Hephaestus" program involving the study of the earth's crust and atmosphere, and the "Prometheus" program pursuing the development of mathematical and information systems to be applied to the solution of questions like the effect of the disarmament process on the world economy.

"Soviet-Italian cooperation is now going through one of its most active development periods," K.V. Frolov said. "It was given a powerful impetus by M.S. Gorbachev's state visit to Italy. A major package of agreements and treaties, opening up great opportunities for scientists from both countries and serving the strengthening of creative ties between them in the interests of the whole world, were signed very quickly and without any of the bureaucratic procrastination that often occurred in the past."

Council of Ministers Greets Finnish Premier

PM0712152189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Council of Ministers message of congratulations to Finnish Prime Minister H. Holkeri on national day]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Harri Holkeri, prime minister of Finland.

We cordially congratulate you, Mr Prime Minister, and also all the members of your government on Finland's national day, Independence Day.

The results of the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to Finland offer reliable guidelines for deepening and improving Soviet-Finnish collaboration. We are sure that, by consistently following a course based on the 1948 Treaty and given new substance in the Soviet-Finnish declaration—the new thinking in action—we will, by our joint efforts, not only mutually enrich the lives of our peoples but also help build a world free of nuclear weapons and violence.

[Signed] The USSR Council of Ministers.

Supreme Soviet Greets Finnish President

PM0712151989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium message of congratulations to Finnish President M. Koivisto on national day]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Mauno Koivisto, President of the Republic of Finland.

We send you, Mr President, and the friendly people of Finland cordial congratulations on your national day—Independence Day.

This date symbolizes for us the connection between the historical destinies of the Soviet and Finnish peoples, equality and respect for one another's interests, and the ability to live in peace and harmony.

There is no doubt that the recent meeting between the Soviet and Finnish leaders will raise the collaboration between our states to a new level of openness and mutual understanding and give it the efficiency and dynamism appropriate to the spirit of the time. The declaration signed during the meeting—a creative contribution by the Soviet Union and neutral Finland to developing the ideas of the new thinking—opens up for our countries broad prospects of cooperation in Europe and the world as a whole on the basis of common human interests.

[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Primakov at Finnish Envoy's Reception

PM0712160789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 6 December H. Talvitie, Finnish ambassador to the Soviet Union, hosted a reception to mark his country's national day, Independence Day.

The reception was attended by Ye.M. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Soviet Fishing Vessel Ablaze Off Bay of Biscay

LD0812135789 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] London December 8 TASS—One person is dead after a fire broke out aboard the Soviet fish-processing vessel, *Vytautas Putna*, in the Bay of Biscay. The crew had to abandon ship after they failed to extinguish the blaze.

A Belgian vessel, *Flamares*, mounted a rescue operation which was coordinated by the British coast guard service. According to its data, 80 Soviet sailors were rescued, one died and one more is missing.

Latin America & Caribbean

Soviet Government Statement on Central America

PM1012203189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 89 Morning Edition p1

["Soviet Government Statement"]

[Text] The extremely exacerbated situation in Central America is causing serious concern. Regardless of the reasons which have led to the present dangerous escalation of tension in this region, the need to take urgent, effective measures to normalize the situation is becoming increasingly obvious. Those directly involved in the conflict, other states with an interest in its earliest possible peaceful settlement, as well as the United Nations and the Organization of American States, are taking steps to help to find ways to resolve the crisis situation. As a result of these efforts, an accord has been reached on holding a meeting of the presidents of the five Central American states in San Jose.

Welcoming this meeting, the Soviet Union confirms its unvarying stand in favor of a peaceful political solution to the region's problems. The foundations for this solution have been laid in the agreements and accords reached at previous conferences of the aforementioned countries' leaders. Full compliance with all the pledges made by the states involved in the conflict is an indispensable condition for establishing lasting peace in this region.

In the opinion of the Soviet Government, implementation of the accords on holding free, democratic elections in Nicaragua, preparation for which is being conducted in full accordance with these accords, and on disbanding the Nicaraguan armed opposition and ending the civil war in El Salvador has priority significance. States outside the region must also contribute to the settlement process, or at least not impede this process if these aims are to be achieved.

In the present situation, the problem of an arms buildup in countries in the region is becoming particularly important. As is well known, the Soviet Union not only has proposed that arms supplies to these countries from whatever source be terminated, but it has also unilaterally suspended these supplies to Nicaragua. The display of similar restraint by other countries, and also the termination of military aid to irregular forces and insurgent movements—which is being urged by the Central American "five" and by the UN Security Council—would doubtless speed up the elimination of this dangerous hotbed of tension. At the same time, talks between the countries of the region on reducing arms and armed forces, as envisaged by the Guatemala Agreement, evidently should not be postponed.

The Soviet Union works on the basis that specific ways and means of normalizing the situation must be determined by the Central Americans themselves. But if they feel that other states could assist this process in some way, this assistance must be given.

The Soviet government hopes that all the participants in the San Jose meeting will again show goodwill, responsibility, and willingness to compromise in order to end the bloodshed and ensure peace and stability in Central America. For its part, the USSR will continue to do its utmost to assist efforts to achieve the above aims and is prepared to collaborate in this with all states without exception.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Central America

*PM1112092389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5*

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, with EFE news agency: "E.A. Shevardnadze's Replies to Questions by Spain's EFE News Agency"—Date and place not given]

[Text] [Question] How do you view the prospects for a Central American settlement, in light of the results of M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. President G. Bush off Malta?

[Answer] Questions relating to the position in Central America really did occupy an important place in M.S. Gorbachev's talks with G. Bush. Moreover, as they both noted when summing up the results of their conversations, the Malta talks did not reveal a full coincidence of views. However, something else is important too: Both the United States and the Soviet Union reiterated their support, in the most definite terms, for a political settlement of the conflict. I think that this assertion provides a platform on which all who are interested in the establishment of lasting peace in the region can concentrate their efforts.

International practice in recent years shows that, to achieve a settlement of conflicts, it is necessary to renounce strongarm tactics and to carry out an intensive search for a balance of interests, even though it may very well be difficult.

It is impossible, for instance, to underestimate the devotion of the Nicaraguan leadership to the idea of holding free and fair elections under international supervision. Establishing proper conditions for such elections seems to us to be one of the key factors in the process of movement toward a settlement. It is now particularly important to avoid anything that might poison the atmosphere with distrust and mutual accusations. A rigorous and honest observance of the obligations one has undertaken must be the basic foundation for the conduct of international affairs in general—and that fully applies to Central America too. That is precisely how the Soviet Union is acting, having declared a cessation of arms deliveries to the region since the end of last year. We have the right to expect just such an approach from all the sides involved.

In this connection, we cannot, of course, fail to be concerned by the fact that a number of the obligations undertaken in respect to the Contras—a long-standing source of military tension in Central America—still remain unfulfilled.

A thought that was voiced during my visit to Nicaragua in October this year still seems to me to be extremely important: The Central American region is overflowing with arms; they do not add to anyone's security; on the contrary, they create a feeling of anxiety and vulnerability among the people of Central America.

The solution here evidently consists in halting any deliveries of arms to the region and to the intraregional transfer of armaments. Moreover, taking into account the fact that the Central American countries are now excessively armed, a reduction of arms to a reasonable level should be regarded as an important and practical goal of the states in the region. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we are prepared to assist in working out suitable criteria for a reasonable level. The Soviet Union would be prepared to act together with the United States as a guarantor that an agreement drawn up for this purpose is observed.

I would also like to stress the thought that from the viewpoint of current international standards, a settlement in Central America is inconceivable without the most strict international supervision involving UN and

OAS potential and various forms and methods of verification. All this is not a manifestation of lack of confidence in anyone in Central America. It is simply that our own experience has convinced us that sincerity, openness, and accessibility to verification are the best way to achieve sound and viable accords.

[Question] What is most disturbing about the current situation in Central America?

[Answer] I am concerned that the development—albeit difficult—of the political process is accompanied by periodic leaps in tension, like the one that we are currently observing in El Salvador. The history of conflict in this country is well known. Evoked by deep socioeconomic causes, it has become aggravated by numerous incidents of the flagrant abuse of human rights. This armed struggle, which is a reaction to this, has given rise to clashes and violence.

In this critical case there is only one way out—political dialogue. The main role naturally belongs to the people of El Salvador themselves. Only constant dialogue in conditions of a cease-fire and strict respect for human rights ultimately will open up the possibilities of a settlement. Currently no one doubts that a stalemate has arisen in that country in which any attempt by the conflicting sides to gain military superiority, let alone victory, has no prospects.

[Question] What, in your opinion, is the most reassuring element in the Central American situation?

[Answer] A whole series of factors give hope. Appropriate accords exist. The task now is to observe them rigorously. Incidentally, the statement of the need for just such an approach is one of the important results of the conversations in Malta.

I can say that after Malta, I exchanged opinions on the problems of Central America with Secretary of State J. Baker. So the dialogue is continuing. Although it is not simple, it is businesslike and in my opinion has elements of constructivism.

With all the complexities which remain in the situation in Central America the fact that the negotiation process has a serious reserve there is important. Contacts between the representatives of the five Central American countries, including at the summit level, have become a regular feature. And now no small hopes are connected with the meeting of the five presidents.

The existing negotiations mechanism should be treated extremely carefully and its further strengthening should be fostered in every way. Incidentally, perhaps it is worth thinking about supplementing the current mechanism with working groups which would, practically on a permament basis, concern themselves with handling specific issues for the implementation of the accords already attained.

And the last element seems not at all without importance to me. Central America has become the focus of heightened international attention. Of course, only the Central Americans themselves are capable of finding a solution which they will observe. But the international community can and must play its weighty role in the encouragement and support of everything positive which is emerging in the situation in the region.

Our own contribution to this comprises not only our political declarations and not only our cessation of arms supplies to the region; it is also expressed in our new readiness to develop contacts with all of the countries of the region up to the establishment of diplomatic relations with those states with which we do not yet have them. our new approach is already bringing practical results. I will note, for example, that at the moment of the latest flash of tension in El Salvador we maintained contacts both with Honduras and with Guatemala and with the government of El Salvador.

To summarize what I have said, I would like to stress that the conversations in Malta permitted both the problems of the region and possible approaches to the resolution of them to be spotlighted. In Central America, primarily by the efforts of its peoples, calm will certainly set in. This would be in the interests both of Central America and of the whole planet, which is on the verge of a new, peaceful period in its history.

Salvadoran Rebel Leader Denies Soviet Arms Supplies

LD0912131989 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Quito, Ecuador, December 9 TASS—The chairman of the Revolutionary Democratic Front of El Salvador, Guillermo Manuel Ungo, described statements that the Soviet Union supplies Salvadoran rebels with arms as completely unfounded.

He said at a news conference here on Friday that such accusations have been made against the Soviet Union throughout the years of the national democratic forces' armed struggle, but they have never been backed up by any proofs.

Meanwhile, Ungo went on, the United States ruling circles extend more than a million dollars a day—according to official figures—in aid, including military, to the Salvadoran regime which uses it to organise mass repressions against the country's democratic forces.

U.S. Unwilling To Halt 'Anti-Nicaraguan' Policy

PY1012213289 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2100 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Vyacheslav Rostovsev commentary]

[Text] In my opinion, it would be advisable to first make clear what we are going to talk about. The resolution we are going to discuss concerns the request Nicaragua made to the United Nations 3 years ago, asking that prestigious international forum to examine the illegal U.S. behavior against that country. The Nicaraguan Government pointed out that this behavior was clearly aggressive.

As a matter of fact, with the help of mercenary soldiers, Washington has been fighting an undeclared war against Nicaragua. This war has caused great damage to that Central American country. Upon examining the Nicaraguan request, the United Nations deemed the U.S. actions illegal and urged Washington to stop supporting the Contras and interfering in Nicaragua's domestic affairs.

The United States refused to acknowledge UN jurisdiction over the issue and decided to continue its anti-Nicaraguan policy. As evidenced in the UN General Assembly's discussion of this issue, Washington is not willing to give up its anti-Nicaraguan policy. The only two countries to reject the General Assembly's resolution on Nicaragua were the United States and Israel.

Washington has thus shown that it will continue to support the anti-Sandinist forces and to finance their actions. It is also clear that the Contras are one of the impediments to solving the Central American conflict. It is more than a coincidence that, during the August 1989 meeting of the five Central American presidents in Honduras, all of them were in favor of demobilizing the Nicaraguan Contras. The demobilization process was scheduled to end on 5 December, but no demobilization has taken place yet. One of the reasons for this failure is that the United States was against the demobilization. This was made clear during the UN General Assembly, when the U.S. Government refused to halt support to the Contras. This means that one of the main obstacles to attaining peace in Central America will continue to exist.

CPSU Central Committee Plenum

CPSU Central Committee Holds Plenum 9 Dec

LD0912192589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the CPSU Central Committee opened at 1000 [local time] this morning in the Kremlin. It discussed issues of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Also on the plenum agenda were the formation of a CPSU Central Committee Bureau for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the nomination of candidates for a USSR people's deputy for the CPSU to replace the deputy who has dropped out.

A speech on the issues of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies was delivered to the plenum by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The text of his speech will be published in the press.

Later in the program we intend to broadcast an information report on the CPSU Central Committee plenum. [This report does not materialize in this Vremya program]

Plenum Speakers, Proceedings Reported

PM1012101189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

["Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"—unattributed report]

[Text] A routine plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee took place here on 9 December 1989 [Saturday]. The plenum considered the following issues:

1. Questions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

2. On forming the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

3. On nominating candidates to USSR people's deputies from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to fill a vacancy and on holding elections of USSR people's deputy from the CPSU.

4. On the address of the CPSU Central Committee to the Soviet people and communists.

CPSU CC [Central Committee] General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov delivered reports on the first issue.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke on the second issue, "on forming the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee."

The following spoke at the plenum: Boris Gidaspov—first secretary of the Leningrad Regional and City Party Committees, Valentin Mesyats—first secretary of the Moscow Regional Party Committee, Svyatosla Medvedev—first secretary of the North Kazakhstan Regional Party Committee of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, Nikolay Slyunkov—secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Vitaliy Masol—chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine, Valeriy Patrikeyev—commander of the Transcaucasian Military District, Aleksandr Melnikov—first secretary of the Kemerovo Regional Party Committee, Anatoliy Logunov—vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, rector of M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State Univesity, Anatoliy Malofeyev—first secretary of the Minsk Regional Party Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, Vadim Bakatin—minister of internal affairs of the USSR, Tatyana Snetkova—assembler of microcircuits at Leningrad's Scientific and Production Association Pozitron, Yuriy Prokofyev—first secretary of the Moscow City Committee, Leonid Zamyatin—Soviet ambassador to Britain, Oleg Zinchenko—member of the Military Council, head of the Political Directorate of the Baltic Military District, Venyamin Afonin—first secretary of the Kuybyshev Regional Party Committee, Aleksandr Chakovsky—secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union, Leonid Khitrun—first secretary of the Ryazan Regional Party Committee, Aleksandr Vlasov—chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, Viktor Pasternak—first secretary of the Khabarovsk Territory Party Committee, Ivan Polozkov—first secretary of the Krasnodar Territory Party Committee, Vitaliy Vorotnikov—chairman of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, Vladimir Karpov—first secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union, Vladimir Zorkaltsev—First Secretary of the Tomsk Regional Party Committee.

The plenum adopted relevant resolutions on the issues under discussion, which are published by the press.

The plenum nominated candidates to USSR people's deputies from the Soviet Communist Party to fill a vacancy and took a resolution on holding elections of USSR people's deputy from the CPSU at the next plenum.

The plenum endorsed an address of the CPSU Central Committee "to the Soviet people and communists", which will be published in the press.

The plenum considered organisational issues.

The plenum elected Vladimir Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum elected Ivan Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and endorsed him as editor-in-chief of the newspaper PRAVDA.

After that the plenum ended its work.

Gorbachev Speaks To 9 Dec CPSU Plenum

PM1012112589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 1-3

[M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the 9 December CPSU Central Committee Plenum]

[Excerpts] Comrades! The Politburo deemed it necessary to exchange views on issues of the second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, which is to begin work in three days, at the present plenum of the party Central Committee.

We all realize the significance of this event. Our whole society has an interest in the success of the work of the congress, and in the focus of its attention being primarily matters to which a solution is vitally needed today. As is well known, preparations for the congress are being carried out by a specially formed commission of deputies. It has been determined that it is to open on 12 December and to finish on approximately 22 December of this year. Members of the Central Committee and other paticipants in the plenum are familiar with proposals for the agenda of the congress. Without dwelling on the details, I will express several ideas as to what dictated these issues being submitted for the consideration of the congress.

First of all, one has to look at the agenda in the context of the actual situation that has developed in our society, and take into account the work that has been done by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I would say that there is heated discussion of the agenda for the forthcoming congress of people's deputies. Together with issues that were prepared and approved beforehand by the Supreme Soviet for discussion at the congress, many others have been put forward. In particular, proposals to discuss and to adopt now, at this congress, laws on ownership, on land, local self-government, and local economic operation, tax policy, and so forth have been mooted.

The question of the inclusion into the agenda of a reappraisal of a number of clauses of the USSR Constitution, including article 6 concerning the role of the party in society, as well as articles relating to the competence of union and republican organs is being raised insistently. You recall that all this was discussed in detail, and as a result the Supreme Soviet recommended the issues familiar to you to be in the agenda. I would not like to limit myself to such a statement. Obviously this should be commented on.

No one casts doubt on the enormous importance the adoption of legislative acts, constituting the legal foundation of the economic system we are radically renewing, has for us and for the further development of perestroyka. Everyone understands this very well. It is the very crucial importance of the aforementioned laws that demands the most profound, thorough elaboration of them and obligatory discussion—I would say, consultation—with all of society, for with them will be connected the whole further fate of the country, of labor collectives, and of every person.

I say this because some of the deputies have been making remarks that might create the impression that someone wants to drag out the adoption of these laws and thereby put a brake on implementing radical economic transformations and perestroyka. This does not correspond to the actual state of affairs. We are all committed to achieving the adoption of the above laws as quickly as possible. We must proceed from this in our future work.

Now for another question that has been widely discussed at the Supreme Soviet in connection with drawing up the agenda, and which now, on the eve of the congress, remains at the center of public attention: I mean the question of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, dealing with the leading role of the party in society.

On the level of principle, I and other comrades have already had occasion to speak on this question, but evidently the Central Committee should adopt a precise and clear position on this matter.

Our position of principle consists of the fact that we firmly adhere to the Leninist concept of a vanguard party. At the current fateful stage of our country's development a strong political party, capable of uniting all healthy forces of the people to deal with the historic task of renewing socialism, is vitally needed.

Here lies the crux of the matter. We see the CPSU as a consolidating and unifying force, and the guarantor of the revolutionary renewal of the land of the soviets, the preservation and increase of its might, and the strengthening of its international authority and prestige. It is also clear to us that the party's authority, and confidence in the party, are determined by the extent to which it successfully performs its role as society's political vanguard. To present the matter as if the situation of the CPSU is determined only by Article 6 means misleading people and confusing them. The Central Committee will resolutely combat attempts to belittle the importance of the party and to undermine its authority with the working people. This must be clear.

Our attitude to Article 6 is derived from this. We have started and are moving along the path of perestroyka of society, and new stages of economic, political, and legal reform, and of the transformation of the Soviet federation, lie ahead. All this demands the introduction of amendments to the USSR Constitution, and ultimately the creation of a new basic law. Within the framework of this process any article can be subject to reinterpretation, or can be excluded. This applies in full to Article 6, all the more so since there was no such special entry on the leading role of the party in the first soviet Constitution, adopted under Lenin. Even in the 1936 Constitution this subject was touched on only in regard to the right of association of citizens.

It must be added that in the conditions of the democratic process that is developing in the country, and renewal of the CPSU, this article does not in itself create any obstacles to the free conduct of elections. This has been shown both by the elections to the Supreme Soviet which have been held, and by the way in which the preparations are going for the elections to local and republican organs of power. The same conclusion arises from the activity of the newly created bodies of supreme power of the country, where democracy, broad openness, and freedom of opinion reign.

For this reason the demand to put the question of Article 6 up for debate on an "emergency footing," and the attempts to attribute extraordinary significance to it are pursuing quite different ends. In this way efforts are being made to demoralize communists and decrease their activeness at a crucial stage of perestroyka, and to set the party off against the workers. We are resolutely against such attempts. They arouse protest from many Soviet people who see in the CPSU a reliable defender of their interests, who value its devotion to perestroyka and socialism, and who want it to be a party of decisive revolutionary acts.

I consider it essential to state today at the plenum of the Central Committee: The CPSU is open to a broad dialogue with all public forces that support the renewal of society, and is committed to their cooperation and consolidation. It is in favor of a constructive approach to the solution of all the problems that have accumulated in different areas of our life. The main thing is the party will firmly defend its policy of expanding the democratic process in the country.

Moreover, the party has embarked upon the road of determined renewal, and this process embraces all aspects of its activity. We are going toward the 28th congress of the CPSU, and a new statute and a policy document are being drafted. What the party should be like in present conditions, and what its role in contemporary society is, all this is already the focus of attention of the pre-congress debates that are developing and will have pride of place in the work of the party congress itself.

The working people of the country, the entire population, are waiting for an answer to the questions: What is the plan of action to remove the strain in finances and on the consumer market; how can we accelerate the execution of economic transformations to give a new dynamism to our national economy more quickly and to make it genuinely efficient and capable of satisfying the multifarious requirements of people and society?

It must be said that the first step in this regard has been taken within the framework of the ratified state plan of economic and social development of the USSR for 1990 and the state budget. Now it is necessary to ensure the fulfilment of all the targetted indices in production, finances, and the social sphere. In a word, the fulfillment of the plan is of extreme importance, everyone should well understand this. Here the explanatory and other multifaceted practical work of party organizations is irreplaceable.

Now we must look into 1991 and the near future. N.I. Ryzhkov will talk about all this in detail in his report. I just want to express some assesments, which, in my view, are of significant importance.

We know what a heated discussion is taking place on the ways of overcoming the present complexities in the economy and embarking on its healthy, stable development. At the second congress, it is necessary to discuss, as it were—to sum all this up, to discuss thoroughly—the measures proposed by the government and to add to them—if necessary—and to work out on this basis a clear, solid program of action. Constructive, considered, responsible discussion of this issue is needed at the congress. I would like to call on all people's deputies to do this.

Why do I think it is important to say this? The point is that opinions among scientists and specialists and, indeed, among the public, differ greatly. Ultimately, however, we need to reach a consensus. this is why we must be very attentive, listen to the arguments of all sides, and act constructively.

We cannot agree with the extremes that have emerged during the discussion. On the one hand, there is the call to revert to the old command methods of economic management which have discredited themselves, and on the other there is the demand to advance at a forced pace, with no regard either for real possibilities or for the mood of society and for how ready for this our people are. It is superfluous to say that this is not an academic question, it is a matter of solving problems which deeply affect the fate of millions of our compatriots. Incorrect orientation in the choice of a path will effect the material position of the working people, and that means their attitude to restructuring, and could lead to society's losing its perspective.

The party must, time and time again, reiterate its fundamental position which can be put as follows: Advancing steadfastly along the path of reforms, carefully making the pace of the advance commensurate with the country's real possibilities and vital interests of Soviet people.

It is important that all strata of society realize that we can overome the difficulties that have arisen and raise the standard of living only with the help of a profound economic reform and the establishment of conditions of economic activity which allow people the real opportunity to dispose of a considerable proportion of the output they produce and to profit from the results of their labor. Of fundamental importance in this regard is the transition from the system of strict centralized planning to a flexible system of regulating—mainly by economic and not administrative means—relations between the central government departments and self-managing enterprises, cooperatives, and other economic associations.

There was something else I wanted to talk about, too. We are being greatly intimidated both from the left and the right with talk of approaching catastrophe and a general crash. It would be but a small misfortune were it done only toward us, the country's leadership. But attempts are being made to impose such views upon people who often cannot evaluate this or that argument and do not have the necessary information at their disposal. political designs are clearly behind this.

Party bodies must arm people with reliable and true political bearings. They must act in such a way as to support creative quest and practical deeds, to protect people who take the plunge, and to create a favorable moral atmosphere for those who genuinely commit themselves to perestroyka.

Despite all the difficult problems in the development of our national economy, it is necessary to see that the country possesses immense potential: The richest natural resources, a powerful production base, and great possibilities in science. Most important of all, an educated people who knows how to work with great commitment. The point is setting into motion all these factors, which is indeed the sense of the economic and political reforms which are being implemented by us.

Now, as a result of the legislative work performed by the Supreme Soviet, opportunities have emerged to accelerate the pace of the transformations. We need to step up the offensive in the main directions of perestroyka, around which the main mass of the workers and all healthy forces in society are consolidating.

Of course, now, when a change in management methods is taking place, it is necessary to devote the most fixed attention to strengthening public order and discipline. It is necessary to promote the formation of a new culture in management relations, whereby things are done not only on the basis of laws or government instructions, but also thanks simply to human decency and to the reliability of a given promise.

We are obliged to relate quite definitively at the Central Committee Plenum that many state and management bodies and organizations are acting, as previously, not according to the demands of perestroyka. Their work does not merely maintain departmentalism, bad management, and irresponsibility—those as yet insurmounted organic defects of the past system of administration. It is worse that they, by their activity, often engender hotbeds of social tension, and that they still too frequently are blind and deaf to the demands, views, and needs of people.

I must say that yesterday and today we have been discussing an issue that directly relates to this theme. The point at issue was that one urgently needs to take measures to maintain a certain level of supply in major industrial centers, to which deliveries from agrarian sectors are disrupted. Such violation of discipline and such an attitude to fulfillment of contracts may end up with "the other side" tomorrow cutting off the gas and oil or beginning to switch off power stations. What will we do then? I think Comrade Yarin said yesterday that a situation was formed in Sverdlovsk whereby only children can be given meat products. Yet there are actual suppliers! Incidentally, after the meeting at the Central Committee with first secretaries of the oblast committees of the Russian Federation, there was a promise from the comrades to resolve these matters.

The party's prestige only suffers from tolerance of such phenomena, and the entire cause of perestroyka also suffers. It is necessary to act vigorously and to make demands through party committees and primary organizations and through Communists in the soviets at all levels.

Comrades, the Supreme Soviet has recommended that the congress also examine a group of constitutional law and political issues. Among these, one must mention, first and foremost, the changes and addenda to the Constitution in connection with the forthcoming elections of bodies of power in the republics and the localities. Their adoption will signify the resolution of the tasks of the second stage of political reform and will create the prerequisites for strengthening the sovereignty of the soviets and for clear demarcation of the functions of party and state bodies.

As a result of a broad and animated discussion which lasted until recently, all the republics have defined the structure of their supreme representative bodies and the procedure for their formation. Generally, as was expected, the discussion in society on these matters was marked with high political activeness of the working people. In the course of it, many proposals have been made which deserve further examination.

The draft law on constitutional supervision in the USSR is among the important issues which have been scheduled for examination at the congress. It must be said that great interest in this is being displayed in our society. That interest is entirely justified.

After all, the point at issue is a new body which is called upon to ensure strict fulfillment of the basic law and to see to the observance of constitutional standards, including issues of delimitation of the competences of the union, union republics, and autonomous formations.

Such an institution is vitally necessary to us in the democratic law-governed state, toward which we are proceeding. Taking into account its purpose, the congress is to adopt a responsible decision about the formation of the composition of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Supervision. As for its chairman, we consider it expedient to recommend Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev for that post. He heads the Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I do not think that I will be exaggerating if I say that Comrade Alekseyev enjoys support and deserved prestige among deputies and the public as a result of the work which he is conducting and as a result of creative, clear, and constructive positions.

The draft rules of the congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and draft laws defining the status and other issues concerning deputies' activity likewise are being presented for discussion by the people's deputies. These documents will assist those elected by the people to conduct their multi-faceted work more fruitfully and to strengthen their links with the electorate, work collectives, and public organizations. One must say that the discussion of them has been serious and acute, and evidently it will continue at the congress.

It is quite justifiably proposed that the question of intensifying the struggle against organized crime should be included in the agenda of the congress. Our people are seriously worried by the growth in violation of the law.

Criminals are acting insolently and aggressively, extremist groups have sprung up, the criminal world is, in effect, throwing down a challenge to the political, economic, and moral foundations of our society, and we are obliged to mobolize the necessary forces and resources in order to cut short this social evil. The measures taken in accordance with the Supreme Soviet decision are now being implemented and certain improvements are occurring, but we are still by no means able to say that everything has already changed for the better. The situation in this respect is still causing concern in society.

The congress is to hear a report from the commissions set up by the first Congress of People's Deputies on the fulfillment of the instructions issued by it. These are the commissions formed in connection with the well-known events in Tbilisi, with the activities of the investigation group of the USSR Procuracy headed by Comrade Gdlyan, and for giving a political and legal assessment of the 1939 Soviet-German treaty on nonaggression.

This is the range of issues on the agenda submitted for the congress by the USSR Supreme Soviet. As you are all fully aware, the second Congress of People's Deputies will take place in a difficult atmosphere, above all in the socioeconomic sphere, which is something we spoke of when opening this Central Committee plenum and confirming its agenda. Understandably people will be very closely following its work, the debate, and the drawing up of measures for stabilizing the economy and ensuring an improvement in living and domestic conditions. It is, therefore, very important that the congress get down to constructive business from the very outset without being sidetracked into fruitless debate and empty time-wasting. I think this is something we must do by the common efforts of all people's deputies.

We hope that the preparations that have been made and the fact that the deputies have received in good time all the necessary documents pertaining to the agenda will allow the congress to be conducted in a business-like and serious manner. Nor can one yet rule out the possibility that attempts will be made to disrupt its work, attempts based by no means on the aims about which I have been speaking, but in pursuance of certain political ambitions or else simply in an endeavor to appear on television more often, which is something that has come into fashion here and is a hallmark of the style of some of our deputies.

I repeat: Our people expect the supreme body of state power to do some business-like work and adopt decisions of vital importance for the country.

Finally, comrades, a draft address from the CPSU Central Committee to the voters has been presented for your examination. It will be published in the near future.

As I have been saying, our society has entered a new stage of political reform. The election campaign has developed extensively nationwide and naturally in this situation there is an insistent need for such a document. The CPSU is approaching the coming elections with a precise and clear program for deepening perestroyka. The party does not intend to retreat a single step from the path of the revolutionary's transformation begun on its initiative. As society's political vanguard, it is called upon to assist to the maximum the nomination for the soviets of the most active representatives of the working class, the peasantry, the intellegentisa, women, and our young people—both Communists and non-party.

The Central Committee of union republic Communist Parties and oblast and kray party committees have been adopting their election programs that take account of local conditions. In present-day conditions, the party must conduct its pre-election work with new approaches to propaganda and agitation. It is necessary to master the normal practice of political campaigning at elections and to regard this as one of the main areas of party work. Of course, comrades, the party and Communists cannot adopt methods that are incompatible with socialist values and our morals and ethics, and become like those who borrow the techniques of bourgeois political struggle. That should be ruled out. However, we ought to be energetic and open to dialogue and act resolutely.

On one more thing: The pre-election campaign of course, should be considered in close relations with our preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. The Politburo proposes to study the issues connected with it [the Congress] in January at a Central Committee plenum. By that time a draft of the political platform of the CPSU "On the course of peresroyka and the tasks of the party" should be prepared, the publication of which will make it possible to develop, as I have already said, a broad precongress discussion in the party and society. We attach immense importance to this plenum, to the elaboration of a program document and its discussion in order to rally communists on a single platform corresponding to the tasks of the present stage in the realization of the policy of perestroyka.

Now the work on the draft of the new CPSU statute has begun. Bearing in mind the opinions of communists, proposals are also being drawn up on the procedure for selecting delegates for the 28th party congress.

In concluding this part of my speech, I would like to speak about the five years experience of perestroyka that has taught us to distinguish the main tasks at each progressive stage. Today it is ensuring a normal labor rhythm for the whole life of society and the creation of an atmosphere of certainty and stability which is coming to the fore. Our democratic undertakings are becoming part of life, they are spreading out in depth and in breadth, they are aimed at the creation of firm guarantees of the widest possible human rights, at defending the interests of the working people. We have come a long way toward this. One can say that through perestroyka and democratization, society has been given a second wind, a new political dynamic.

But this is only part of the total picture of the processes taking place in the country. In our society there are also forces trying to turn glasnost and democracy against the things they are designed to serve. In their attempts to achieve their goals these forces do not take into account either the demands of law, nor morality, nor even elementary deceny.

It must be said with full responsibility that the attempts to impose by force on Soviet people any sort of subjective, one-sided views are destructive to perestroyka. We reject decisively this approach to solving pressing problems. All those on whom the maintenance of legality and law and order depends must take this as a starting point in their practical activity.

Comrades, we cannot ignore the flow of demands from citizens to ensure the creative direction of the processes of perestroyka. Soviet people do not want to accept the situation where, when the normal rhythm of life is violated, the authorities in the localities and at the center quite often stand idly by.

It is completely unacceptable when they watch calmly as the social situation worsens and they lag behind events. As a rule this leads to a loss of control over the situation. Now very frequently, cases end in an appeal to the central authorities for help and protection, and not infrequently in pushing them into using extreme methods to get out of complex situations. This must be decisively corrected in our methods of work. In such stormy times none of those invested with power and responsibility can sit on the fence and watch idly, at best sending information and calls for help.

It must be said that the bodies of law and order frequently give up under the pressure of destructive forces and do not take the essential measures prescribed by law.

We must be self-critical. Both the Politburo and the Communists in the Government and Supreme Soviet do not always act in time and effectively, in accordance with the demands of the situation. We must no longer accept the way that in a number of cases, when there is a need to be demanding and principled, we act indecisively, fearing to get a reputation of being "out of date", and undemocratic.

Irresponsible people employ this. Is this not what is shown by the attempt by a group of people's deputies, three of whom are joint presidents of the interregional group, to organize a political strike on the eve of the Second Congress of People's Deputies? It seems to me that they should be answerable for this before the Supreme Soviet, and the Communist Party members before their party organizations.

Today I want to draw your attention once again to the high level of responsibility of the mass information media towards the people. Their role in moving perestroyka forward and in defending its aims is exceptionally great. They cannot be indifferent to the problems that the country is living through at this crucial stage in our history. From this point of view we can give a positive evaluation to the contribution they have made and are making to the expansion of revolutionary transformations.

One can understand the sharpness with which the problems of social life are illustrated in the press, even if here sometimes controversial opinions are allowed to appear. But in just the same way it should be clear that the mass media belong to society and must defend the principles by which this society lives. The main thing that one must bear in mind is that people believe the press, radio, and television. For this reason not only juggling with the facts and the publication of doubtful information and statements, but also simply lack of objectivity are impermissible.

Of course, we must resolutely condemn attempts to use any press organ for antisocial, inflammatory purposes to permit a distorted, prejudiced approach to the issues of inter-relations between nations and ethnic groups and to the issue of the cadres' activities.

In general we must exclude any monopoly. The mass media must cover the very complex, difficult transfer of our country to a renewed society, when we are producing fundamental transformation, in a calm, objective, principled, and truthful manner. This is, after all, the fate of the country, the fate of socialism. It is necessary to talk about this once more at the Central Committee plenum. You know my position, I am talking openly now as well: The situation should not arise that the cares of the working class, the working people are not reflected in the press.

We cannot allow moral and cultural values—which are dubious, to say the least, at times—to receive a stamp of approval through the press to enter our lives.

I am sure that the heads of the mass information media at all levels—and the majority of them are Communists—will be sufficiently responsible in this difficult, critical period of restructuring to concentrate all efforts upon mobilizing people in creative actions and in a genuine renewal of all aspects of our lives. They are called upon to demonstrate both a new experience of work, and real results of perestroyka in the collective, the rayon, town, oblast, republic, and in the country—as well as pointing out everything that continues to hinder us, to hold back by the coat tails, to put a brake on the speed and results of the transformations that have been begun.

The role of our press in explanatory work is particularly great. A multitude of new ideas, solutions, and laws is now entering society, and behind these is the practice of restructuring of the economy, the political process and other spheres of life. All this requires explanation and interpretation—it is with this that both the party and the mass information media must concern themselves today.

In a word, we must be decisive in advancing restructuring in all directions, in defending its goals and ideals, and in supporting everything new and interesting and constructive that changes the life of the people for the better. Just the same way we must be consistent and uncompromising in the fight against slackness, mismanagement, and irresponsibility.

This places high demands upon all levels of our party. A high discussion on the whole range of these issues is brewing, I think, and we intend to hold it at the January Central Committee plenum during discussion of the draft political platform for the 28th CPSU Congress.

"Comrades, implementation of the long-term course of perestroyka exerts not only a revolutionary influence on all the spheres of life of Soviet society, but also influences other socialist countries and developments in the world. At the same time perestroyka itself comes under the influence of the world, and needs favourable international conditions.

Proceeding from this, I deem it necessary to report to the Central Committee on latest international events which directly affect our interests.

This year has been marked by major changes in Eastern Europe. It must be said plainly that processes there are developing swiftly. Speaking about the essence of the changes underway, their most typical feature is democratization and renewal of socialism. It is an open secret that these processes do not proceed easily. The truth, about which we spoke so often in the past few years, has been reaffirmed once again: Where there is a delay in dealing with overripe problems, there is inevitably a price to pay.

What is taking place in socialist countries is the logical outcome of a certain stage of development which made the peoples of these countries aware of the need for change. This is the result of internal development, the result of choice by peoples themselves.

For all the specificity of deep changes in socialist countries, one cannot deny the fact that they proceed in the same mainstream as our perestroyka, although we in no way encouraged these processes.

In some socialist countries the situation has been unconventional. Fraternal parties are no longer ruling in Poland and Hungary. Our friends in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia have largely lost their positions. New political forces have emerged on the arena. They include both those who support the socialist idea and those who seek other ways of social development.

The new situation demands from our friends resolute, well-considered actions in order to restore their influence and positions in society and, consequently, to elaborate a new strategy and tactic. The task of consolidating all forces standing on the positions of socialism, democracy and progress has moved into the forefront.

Our friends realize this and take account of the situation in their activity, even though they have to master on the move the science of political work in the new conditions of real, rather than declarative, pluralism.

The situation that arises also demands from us the elaboration of a clear-cut approach to both the processes underway there and our contacts with the new political forces, parties and organizations.

Our principled attitude to these processes can be formulated in the following way. We welcome the positive changes while fully realizing the difficulties, both domestic and international, that accompany them.

The Soviet Union is building its relations with East European countries—whether they have been carrying out transformations for quite some time, or have only embarked on that road, or are yet to do it—on a single position of respect for sovereignty, non- interference and recognition of freedom of choice. We proceed from the fact that any nation has the right to decide its fate itself, including the choice of a system, ways, the pace and methods of its development.

Our principled attitude to the European socialist countries is invariable. They are not only our allies, but also our friends and neighbours. We seek to ensure progress and stability in every way—stability in these countries themselves, the East European region and the whole continent—as well as the inviolability of post-war borders of all the states in Europe. It is precisely for these purposes that our diplomats are engaged in active work with all European countries without exclusion and the United States.

Of course we can see that, despite declaring noninterference, some Western countries cannot resist the temptation to influence the processes under way in socialist countries. We are doing everything possible to prevent interference from outside and to neutralize attempts at such interference, in particular, in regard of the GDR.

We stress with the utmost resoluteness that we will see to it that no harm comes to the GDR. It is our strategic ally and a member of the Warsaw Treaty. It is necessary to proceed from the post-war realities—the existence of the two sovereign German states, members of the United Nations. Departure from this threatens with destabilization in Europe.

Naturally this is not to say that relations between the GDR and the FRG cannot change. Peaceful cooperation between them can and must develop. As for the future, it will take shape in the course of history, in the framework of the development of the general European process.

On our part, we continue actively supporting the allied contacts.

A Warsaw Treaty summit meeting has been held in Moscow recently. We informed the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty states in detail of our talks with the U.S. President and our evaluations of the international situation.

A common position concerning the need to further refine the activities of the Warsaw Treaty was reaffirmed at the meeting. So, our alliance is living through a period of tests, is renewing itself, retaining its value to all members. This is so because the community of our interests in ensuring stabilty and peace in Europe is maintained.

This was confirmed convincingly enough by the recent visit to Moscow by the head of the new Polish Government. During the talks the Polish side expressed not only interest in the development of relations with the Soviet Union but also devotion to its allied commitments.

Of course, we are yet to work a good deal to refine the forms of political and economic cooperation within the framework of collective organizations and to bring it up to a qualitatively new level.

This particularly applies to the activities of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) where cardinal changes in the mechanism of cooperation are needed and it is essential to put it on a sound economic track, without which it is inconceivable to accomplish one of the main task sof the present day—to gradually integrate the economies of our countries into all-European and world structures.

Now a few words about the main recent contacts with capitalist countries.

West European countries are obviously conspicuous in this respect. The meetings with the leaders of Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and other countries have not just become more systematic but their political productiveness has also considerably increased.

It was difficult, it would seem, to count on an additional benefit, say, from the traditionally friendly relations with Finland. But the visit there and the talks with President Mauno Koivosto made it possible to realistically raise the degree of political trust and broaden the scope of economic cooperation. This is of particular importance to our regions that neighbour on Finland—Karelia, the Baltic republics, and the north as a whole.

The results of the talks with the state leadership of Italy proved tangible, too. This country in the past, too, more than once made pioneering moves in the search for new forms of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

This time the agreements and contracts signed—I shall mention an agreement with Fiat on the construction of a car factory—should produce postive results for the Soviet economy and for the saturation of the market.

The Soviet-Finnish and Soviet-Italian political declarations have become the latest word in the philosophical and conceptual substantiation of East-West cooperation.

The meeting with the pope in the Vatican was of fundamental importance. If the policy of the Vatican, a full and equal participant in the CSCE process, proceeds towards further humaniztation and democratization of inter-state relations, that will also help solve world problems.

An agreement to add a greater official character to our relations with the Vatican may play a useful role.

Finally, it is necessary especially to single out the working meeting with French President Francois Mitterrand in Kiev.

Of course, he was very interested in the results of the Malta meeting. But the rapidly changing situation in Europe was a matter of his principal concern and the central topic of the talks with him.

The French president believes that it is now necessary to show maximum of caution and to take up a well-considered attitude and that the Helsinki principles—and, primarily, respect for the present realities and the inviolability of the established borders—should be the basis for the development of all processes in Europe.

As is seen, the views formulated by him are extremely close to ours. And we reaffirmed this, and pointed out that a new mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and France is taking shape and a basis for effective cooperation is being furnished on the strength of the stand set out by the French president.

As regards our relations with Western Europe as a whole, the events of the outgoing year make it possible to single out three main aspects.

The first of them is an indisputable fundamental change in the West Europeans' attitude to the Soviet Union and to perestroyka. Of course, in today's Europe still there are doubts as to how our internal political development will proceed.

But on the whole the Europeans have come to realize that perestroyka is a perceptible reality that is not only changing our country but is also having an impact on the rest of the world.

There is a gradually growing awareness of yet another circumstance, namely, that we are carrying out perestroyka on the basis of our own, socialist principles.

That, while refining our society and enriching our economic and social instruments by new methods and forms, we by no means depart from our values but on the contrary we seek to fill them with a realistic, humanistic and democratic content.

At one time, after the October revolution, as you may remember, our country lived through a period of diplomatic recognitions.

Nowadays we are living through a period of recognition of perestroyka as a factor of worldwide significance. This creates a new atmosphere in our relations with the West as a whole and primarily with Western Europe.

The second important aspect is closely interconnected with the first one: West European countries have in actual fact taken a course towards increasing economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The West European business community has come to realize that perestroyka provides a new market for it. Competition for places in this market has begun.

Hence, not only new contracts signed with a growing number of West European firms, the contracts that are large but in many respects qualitatively new ones, intended for co-production arrangements and even for a sort of integration with our economy.

Finally, the third important aspect in our relations with Western Europe is that the drawing closer together of our and West European countries' positions on major international problems is increasingly manifest.

The matter concerns both many aspects of disarmament, primarily the Vienna talks on conventional arms in Europe, and approaches to regional conflicts and ways to resolve global problems that arise on the European Continent itself.

All this means that our relations with West European countries acquire both a new format and new contents. A more developed infrastructure of links, capable of growing into a kind of common European mechanism of cooperation, is being set up. In fact, the point at issue is a marked advance on the road of building a common European home.

Changes in the East and West of the continent, the accelerating pace of developments call increasingly obviously for increasing the rates and expanding the contents of the general European process. Proceeding from this, we have proposed to hold a new European meeting already in 1990 and not in 1992 as was planned earlier. Such a meeting could be held at summit level. France and Italy supported this initiative. Admittedly, other participants in the European process also view it with interest. We are convinced that its implementation, the holding of the Helsinki-2 meeting would give powerful impetus to the construction of the common European home in all of its main parameters.

For all the advancement of our relations with Europe, further normalization and improvement of USSR-U.S. relations has a mulifaceted, truly global significance. It is a fact that the USSR and the U.S. are two major and the most powerful states in the modern world. This does not give them any special rights, but determines their special responsibility for preserving and strengthening peace.

It is also absolutely obvious that political interaction between the USSR and the U.S. on the principles of new thinking can have a powerful influence on the positive development of the world situation.

We were fully aware of all this, when we agreed to a working meeting in Malta proposed by U.S. President George Bush.

Comrades are familiar with the contents of the joint news conference with President Bush. The main thing about our talks was told there, but understandably without special details. Nevertheless, some summing up seems to be needed.

Naturally we wanted the meeting with the U.S. President to give tangible useful results. From the first moments George Bush showed that he also sought a similar outcome.

He started talks with the problem of improving bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. He especially dwelt on his decision to take the necessary measures in the near future to lift restrictions hampering trade and economic ties between the two countries.

Bush in fact intends to give the USSR most-favoured-nation status, to enable U.S. financial institutions to credit exports, as well as to grant credits and to conclude an agreement on guaranteeing U.S. investments in the Soviet Union. These and some other steps undertaken by the administration give the U.S. business circles a signal to act more boldly on the Soviet market. This corresponds to their feelings.

It is also important that the U.S. leadership is changing its approach to Soviet participation in international economic and financial organisations. On the whole, there is an impression that Washington has decided to stop "economic war" against us.

Summing up the results of the rather intensive discussion of military-political issues, one can say sufficiently firmly that the year 1990 promises to be one of the most productive periods in terms of agreements in this field. Specifically, we agreed with the President that next year will be signed:

—The Soviet-U.S. treaty on a 50 per cent cut in strategic offensive weapons.

—A multilateral agreement on reductions in conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe, which, as we suggested, is subjected to signature at summit level;

—A bilateral Soviet-American agreement on a radical cut in the arsenals of chemical weapons, as part of efforts to fully ban chemical weapons and to eliminate their stocks;

—Protocols to the 1974 and 1976 treaties on the limitation on underground tests of nuclear weapons and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

Besides, we hope that talks will be started in 1990 on new spheres of the limitation of armaments, the building of security and stability.

Bush and we agreed that the two sides would actively participate in multilateral talks on "the open skies" as well as on the concept, which we suggested, of greater openness covering not only the skies, but also land, seas, oceans and outer space.

We suggested that talks concerning Soviet and American naval forces as well as full elimination of the naval tactical nuclear weapons be started without delay.

The Soviet Union attaches much importance to this issue, for in the conditions of progress in the efforts to reduce arms in various fields, we cannot put up with a threat to our security and to the security of our allies, the threat emanating from the seas and oceans.

I have already publicly set out our evaluation of the talks on European topics. I would like only to emphasize that Bush and I achieved a reassuring degree of mutual understanding about the need to pursue a well-considered and cautious line in the conditions of deep processes taking place in Western and Eastern Europe.

This also applies to German problems. I think that it is also of importance that we regard all these problems primarily with in the context of the CSCE process.

The talks on regional conflicts concerned Afghanistan, Central America, the Middle East, Lebanon, and some other problems.

In general, I would like to point out that the talks on these acute topics were this time held in a more businesslike and substantive manner.

The two sides showed greater readiness to take mutual interests into account. They showed an increased ability to perceive each other's arguments. In general, the talks in this respect were notable for a markedly unbiased attitude to the evaluations, information and positions of the partner.

Of course, divergences of opinion, and considerable ones, still remain. But it is important that a different, more businesslike and reasonable approach has appeared. Accordingly, we are now taking a more optimistic view on prospects for a peaceful settlement.

On the whole President Bush and we had wide-ranging talks. We consider them as the beginning of a new stage in Soviet-American relations. And, I repeat, great and tangible changes are taking place.

A transition from confrontation to greater mutual understanding has already taken place. We are now moving to a higher degree of mutual understanding and even cooperation. If the U.S. leadership continues to act from the position of high responsibility, we may move to a business partnership.

And now the last remark. What specifically did the work done in the foreign policy sphere produce for the cause of peace, for our country and for perestroyka?

To begin with, it has pushed the threat of war still farther away and ensured the consolidation of the foundations of international security. This signifies that hopes for the preservation and strengthening of favourable external conditions for our development are becoming increasingly substantial.

This enables us to carry out the planned cuts in defence spending and in the armed forces and to develop defence production conversion.

While doing all this, we should not of course lose sight of the fact that influential circles in the West have not yet abandoned the position-of-strength policy and still seek to gain one-sided advantages for themselves.

In present-day conditions, just as in the future, reasonable sufficiency presupposes absolute ensurance of the defense of the legitimate interests of our country. This is what we proceed from.

I also want to speak of this in the following connection: On the one hand, we want, as a result of disarmament processes, to slow down the arms race, into which we have found ourselves drawn together with America and other countries.

Even for the current five-year plan period, a national income increment—I do not know whether I mentioned it at the Central Committee's plenum or not—was set at approximately 22 per cent while military expenditures were set at more than 40 per cent.

That is even an income increment was to be swallowed by the arms race to a considerable extent. [sentence as received] We see how this influenced the economic development and deformed it.

It is essential to get rid of such extremes. But the country's reliable security cannot be the subject of discussions. We should have a modern army equipped with the latest weapons and capable of ensuring the country's security.

When the disarmament process began to develop, quite far-fetched proposals were made by some people to the effect that we should even eliminate the army and the entire defence sector.

This is not serious, and one did not even need to react to that. But it must be said that there are attempts at suggesting such views to public opinion, at stirring up some ferment with regard to the army and to those people that are in charge of defence.

I think we should cut off these extremes by directing work on security questions into a normal and natural channel. When ensuring the guarantee of the country's defense, one should not fall into any extremes.

Normalization and improvement of relations with the West enable us to further broaden the scope and to extend the substance of cooperation with capitalist countries. We are increasingly developing new forms of interrelation, extending them, as I already said, to cooperation mechanism and in some cases approaching integration links. Undoubtedly, this considerably enriches our possibilities. Naturally one should fully realize that we will be able to use them only if we considerably step up our own efforts, responsibility and efficiency, master new forms of cooperation. During the recent summit meetings, in particular, in Britain, France, Finland and Italy we have agreed that, while concluding new agreements and signing contracts, reliable mechanisms should be set up to monitor compliance with them. These mechanisms should also function impeccably from our side as well.

On the whole, one can say that our initiatives in the international arena have returned to the USSR and its foreign policy global recognition as a factor of peace, security and freedom. Realistic attitudes to existing problems and due regard for the interests of all members of the world community ensure the high effectiveness of these initiatives. All this promotes the fulfillment of perestroyka, creating an international background necessary for its advancement.

In conclusion, comrades, I would like to say this. This is now an incredibly responsible and complex period in world life and in the development of our country's socialism. Changes of fundamental significance are taking place, and institutions are being created which will define what our society will be like for decades to come. That is a measure of the responsibility of the CPSU, which is generating the policy of perestroyka and uniting and consolidating society for the sake of the achievement of these great goals.

It is difficult for us and we are coming up against extraordinary events and situations. However, comrades, such watersheds, such changes, cannot take place smoothly.

These are revolutionary events, they are being implemented in revolutionary forms, and they are accompanied by the destruction of stereotypes to which society has become accustomed. Above all, it is a real revolution in minds.

I would ask members of the Central Committee and leaders at all levels to maintain a "loftiness of view" in the analysis of events. If we come under the pressure of current events and individual cases, if we panic, if we lose our way, this will be transmitted to the entire party and people. One must not behave nervously, however difficult this may be. We are not guaranteed against errors, and we have made miscalculations in the perestroyka years, too, but we must act in such a way that there are fewer of these errors, and we must measure each practical step against the long-term guidelines in order to move confidently along the chosen path.

I hope that there is complete mutual understanding in this respect in our Party Central Committee at this exceptionally important stage. (Applause).

Gorbachev Remarks on Upcoming Congress

LD1012000789 Moscow World Service in Englisl
2130 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Excerpt] The full-scale meeting of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has ended in Moscow after discussing a range of issues to be brought before the Second Congress of People's Deputies due to open in the Soviet capital on Tuesday [12 December]. General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev made a keynote speech.

He spoke of a heated debate going on in the run-up to the congress about its agenda. Along with the issues prepared and approved by the Supreme Soviet for discussion by the congress he said other issues were brought in including motions on the debate and approval by the Second Congress of bills on property rights, land ownership, local government and economy, taxation, and so on.

Stressing the great importance of such laws being adopted to push the Soviet reform, the general secretary said that given their crucial significance these laws needed a thorough refinement followed by mandatory public discussion.

On the Constitution's Article 6 on the party's leading role in the society, Mikhail Gorbachev said constitutional changes were needed ahead of the new stages of economic, political, and legal reforms and the transformation of the Soviet federation. In the long run this would lead to creating a new basic legislation. In the process any article may be subject to reassessment or (?deletion), he said, including Article 6.

On the issue of how long it would take to produce and adopt the new constitution, the Soviet leader stressed the need for producing a long-term legislation which will be the fifth of its kind in the country's history.

The general secretary has described the government report on economic recovery measures, reform stages, and the 15th [as heard] 5-year plan as the topmost issue on the agenda of the congress. With heated debate now under way in the country on ways of overcoming the present economic hardships to ensure a stable economic recovery, the party, he said, must reiterate its firm position which can be summed up as follows: A sustained movement on the path of reform and a careful measuring of its pace against what the country could really afford and the prime needs of the nation. Overcoming the difficulties and raising living standards could be achieved only through deep economic reform and in economic management, which would provide the people with a real chance of disposing as they please a substantial part of what they produce. He said the legislative work done by the Supreme Soviet was opening opportunities for a greater pace of reform.

The general secretary said the adoption by the congress of constitutional amendments relating to the electoral system would create conditions for greater say by the local councils and for a clear line between party and government functions.

He next said the 5 years of perestroyka had taught the party to outline the main priority at each of its stages. The overriding priority now, he said was to ensure a normal pace of work by the society and to create an atmosphere of confidence and stability. We must be firm, he said, in pushing the reform in all its directions.

The general secretary also focused on recent international events which are directly affecting the Soviet Union's interests.

Plenum Issues Resolution

PM1012103189 Moscow PRAVDA in English 10 Dec Second Edition p 1

["CPSU Central Committee Plenum Resolution of 9 December 1989: Questions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies"—unattributed report]

[Text] 1. The plenum agrees with the evaluations and conclusions set out in remarks by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on matters concerning the holding of the Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies.

2. The plenum of the CPSU Central Committee supports proposals by the USSR Government on measures to normalise the economy, on stages of the economic reform and on the principled approaches to the elaboration of the 13th Five-Year Plan that are being brought up for discussion at the congress of the USSR People's Deputies.

3. The plenum accepts the proposal to hold an enlarged plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee in January 1990 to deal with matters concerning preparations for the CPSU's 28th congress.

The Politburo of the Central Committee is being commissioned to decide on who would participate in the forthcoming plenary meeting and to prepare the necessary materials.

Platform for 28th Party Congress To Be Published

LD0912204589 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, told a news conference in Moscow on Saturday that the Central Committee will hold an extended plenum next January to discuss preparation for the 28th party congress.

Medvedev said that a draft platform for the 28th congress will be published in January for the general party discusion, after preliminary discussion at the extended plenum.

Gorbachev Announces Formation of Russian Bureau

LD1012114189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Report: "On the Formation of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee; Report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 9 December 1989"]

[Text] Comrades! As you recall, at the last CPSU Central Committee plenum we began a talk on the expedience of creating in the Central Committee appropriate structures for coordinating party work in the Russian Federation.

With all the importance of what is happening now in the country and in all the republics, the problems of Russia are of crucial importance to the fate of perestroyka and the consolidation of the progress of our multinational union.

These problems have accumulated over a prolonged period and their solution demands the joint efforts of the people and the coordinated actions of the communists of the republic, the soviets, and all state and public organizations.

To put it briefly, the Russian Federation indubitably deserves a different approach and different attention. I think the members of the Central Committee share this view. What's more, several have already spoken on this issue.

We are all aware that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] is a most complex political, socioeconomic and ethnic formation. No value can be placed on the role played by the Russian people and the other peoples of the Russian Federation in the revolutionary transformation initiated by Great October, in changing the Soviet Union into a mighty industrial country, in overcoming the economic and cultural backwardness of many nationalities and ethnic groups, and in defending the independence of our state and the gains of socialism on the battlefields of the great patriotic war. In contemporary conditions too, the republic's working people are making an enornmous contribution to the development of the country as a whole and to the unfolding of the restructuring processes.

It is well known what unique economic, scientific, and technical potential the Russian Federation possesses. More than half, 51.2 percent, if one of is to be precise, of the country's population lives on its territory. The proportion of the national income from the Russian Federation amounts to around 60 percent. The predominant part of fuel, power, water, timber resources, and mineral reserves are concentrated in Russia. The republic produces 92 percent of oil and timber, 84 percent of goods vehicles, 74 percent of gas, 62 percent of electricity, around 60 percent of cement, plastics, synthetic resins, and the major proportion of defense output.

A large part of the imports used in the country is covered by export profits from Russian Federation products.

Truly, those who describe the RSFSR as the backbone of our union are right, but we also know that the huge achievements of the Russian and other peoples of the Russian Federation are indissolubly linked with the efforts, the long years of efforts, and the great contribution of the other Soviet peoples of all of our republics.

Much has been done in the republic through the people's persistent, self-sacrificing labor in the last few years, too. Impressive programs for mastering new regions have been implemented, roads thousands of kilometers long have been laid, new towns have been built, life has come to the most far-flung Russian backwaters. At the same time problems have made themselves felt more and more, which have their source in distortions of the principles of economic and social policy and gross mistakes and errors in locating production forces. The main thing is that the atmosphere of stagnation made it impossible to make in good time the changes dictated by the times, or to make use of the possibilities and to take into account the demands of scientific and technical progress.

Serious deformations and miscalculations in policy and practical activity inflicted considerable losses on the Russian Federation and affected the social development of towns and villages in the center of Russia, Siberia, the Far East, and other regions of the RSFSR. They gave rise to an unfavorable demographic situation which is threatening the ecological situation in whole regions. The decisions made on the nonchernozem area, and indeed for other regions, particularly for the development of the eastern regions of the country, were clearly inadequate. In addition, they were not even fulfilled to their full extent.

Self-government in the autonomous republics, krays, oblasts, and okrugs was of an essentially formal nature. Many peoples of the north, of Siberia, and of the Far East found themselves in a difficult position.

As in other regions of the country, many historical and cultural monuments have been lost in the RSFSR. Although considerable efforts have been made recently to save our cultural property, there is still a whole lot of work to be done, as they say.

In recent times arguments have sometimes been heard to the effect that the country's past deformations and present difficulties are primarily derived from Russia, which is here identified with the center. Let us say openly that such arguments contradict both historical truth and simple human objectivity. It is not the Russians, or the representatives of any other nationality, who are guilty of our misfortunes, comrades, but Stalinism and the system of administration by injunction, the weight of which all of the USSR's people have felt for themselves and of which we are now ridding ourselves with great difficulties.

It must be taken into account that the Russian people have had to overcome an economic and cultural backwardness, which has been inherited; huge losses; and havoc in the years of the civil and great patriotic wars; and to bear huge expenditures ensuring the security of the country.

Whatever aspect of life we take—economic, social, spiritual—everything indicates that there is a pressing need for a fundamental change of attitude to Russian problems. The solutions to these problems can of course be found only through the channel of perestroyka and deep transformations: socioeconomic, political, and organizational.

Numerous proposals directed at strengthening Russia's state sovereignty, are coming in. As is well known, measures to create new republican bodies have already been undertaken and will continue to be undertaken. For the first time in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chambers are being formed—soviet of the republic and soviet of nationalities.

The union construction ministries have been transferred to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR and a union-republican ministry of internal affairs has been formed. A number of measures in the development of the Russian Federation's mass information media have been approved, regular Russian programs will be introduced on central television, and all-union radio and new newspapers and sociopolitical and literary journals will begin to be published. An initiative is being put forward to set up republican trade union and Komsomol structures and for other public organizations. The issue of forming a Russian academy of sciences is being worked on actively.

Of course, in examining the problems of the Russian Federation, one cannot get by without movement forward in issues of party construction.

What then should the leading organ of the party organizations of the RSFSR be like? This is a very important and multifaceted question. It goes beyond the framework of the Russian Federation and has a partywide and unionwide character.

The discussion that has unfolded shows that the range of opinions is extremely broad, going so far as ones that are mutually exclusive: from calls for a Communist Party and accordingly a Russian Communist Party Central Committee to be set up, to proposals that everything should be left as it is. Different points of view are based upon specific ground and arguments. Therefore, we must make a decision in an extremely circumspect and well-considered way. Whether we like it or not, the historic role, the political weight, the economic potential, the huge territory, the multiethnic composition, and a whole range of other factors determine the special nature of the RSFSR's position in the Soviet Union and exclude any kind of simplification in the solution of Russian problems.

We have discussed this issue at the Central Committee on more than one occasion with the leaders of the republic's kray and oblast party organizations taking part; and we came to the conclusion that setting up a CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau at the present stage is expedient.

I would like to add to what has been said in describing the RSFSR that 54.5 percent of CPSU members and candidate members live and work here. More than 46 percent of all primary CPSU organizations are in Russia. Fifty-two percent of primary party organizations headed by party committees and three quarters of those headed by party committees with the rights of rayon committees, of the total number of these in the party, operate in the republic. In other words, the major CPSU organizations are, for the most part, concentrated within the Russian Federation.

What do we have to proceed from? It seems to me that only a decision that takes into account the interests of both the Russian Federation and the union as a whole can be the right one. It is precisely such a balanced consideration of all-union and republican interests that is embodied in the tenets of principle of the CPSU platform on the nationalities policy.

The party's aspiration to restore Lenin's principle of national self-determination in our union is clearly expressed in it. This presupposes filling the sovereignty of the union republics with real content in the consolidation of their political, economic, and cultural independence.

Along the course that has been mapped out, measures on democratizing intraparty relations; on increasing the role of primary, rayon, okrug, city, oblast, kray, and especially, republican party organizations in solving the basic issues of their practical activity being implemented by the Central Committee.

All this, without question, concerns Russia too. The process of its national self-determination also presupposes filling the life of all state and public republican organizations, and it goes without saying, party ones, with a new content. This means broader opportunities for realizing the Russian Federation's political potential and strengthening the democratic line in the party and in society's whole political system.

At the same time, dealing with the problems of the RSFSR's sociopolitical life, we are being guided by the provision of the party platform on the nationalities issue on the fact that objectively it was and remains the consolidating basis of our whole union. All our steps in the direction of organizing Russia's party forces should be tested by the criterion of our union's consolidation and our party's unity. We should clearly envision how this or that decision will influence centrifugal and centripetal trends, whether or not it will disturb the organic equilibrium in the union as a whole, and whether or not it will add fuel to the flames that some people are earnestly fanning today.

In restructuring the party and expanding republican party organizations' rights and independence in every way, we are obliged to keep attentive watch so as not to cross the line past which there would arise the danger of destruction of the CPSU as a united political organization and as a most important integratng force of the union.

Unfortunately, not everyone in the party is fully aware of the possible destructive consequences of CPSU federalization. There are also those who sense the danger that threatens, but who do not know how to combat it, how to withstand the political storm, and who are thus moving in the direction this elemental force is carrying them. The essence of our position is that expanding the rights and independence of republican party organizations must contribute to better consideration of national characteristics and local specific features and to the skillful combination of national and internationalist values rather than to setting these against one another.

If this vital nerve of our entire political organism is damaged, a very great deal may be placed under threat.

In this connection, I should, at the party Central Committee plenum, like to address once more the Communist Party Central Committee, and all the Communists of Lithuania, where these issues have taken acute urgency. It is precisely this that dictates my address to the Lithuanian Communists. I would ask them to pay the very greatest attention to our concern. We hope that the republic's Communist Party congress, which you are to hold very soon and at which there will be a discussion of pressing problems, will be a kind of working through of proposals for the 28th CPSU congress. Comrade Brazauskas, I am telling you this bluntly in front of the entire party Central Committee: Do not belittle your personal role as Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary in correctly dealing with these issues.

It is evident that specific measures are needed to raise the status of Russia's party organizations. At the same time it is important that these measures should be of a considered nature and be implemented in step with the amassing of experience. We therefore consider the proposal to form a CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau a first step in the formation of the republic's new party structures. How developments will go on, life, political practice, and experience will show.

Nowadays, all of society is changing radically and the methods and forms of party work are being renewed. Conditions have been created for the free expression of Communists' views and for multicandidate elections of leaders and the apparat's work is being restructured. All areas of party life are open to criticism. In the center and at local level active searches for ways to assert what Lenin caled "the power of the party masses" are under way.

CPSU functions are changing radically now, too. We are talking of the party as the political vanguard of society which rejects command methods of leadership using directives, and which does not intend to foist anything on anyone. It must be capable of expressing clearly and precisely in its policy what the people acknowledge and of acting by methods of persuasion, of influencing with ideas, taking part in all the processes of the life of society via communists. We are renewing the party, restructuring it, taking into account its new functions as the political vanguard of society, but we remain in all spheres of society's life. The party, in proposing its policy to the people, in consulting with them, will defend it everywhere communists work.

I am sure under the new conditions the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau can and must become a political body of full value, capable of solving practical tasks independently. Every possibility has been created by perestroyka for this.

So far as its size is concerned, it is proposed to form a small bureau. Taking into account the significance of the Russian Federation's party organization in general party life, the Politburo is putting forward for your consideration the proposal that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary head this bureau.

It would be possible to introduce into the composition of the Central Committee bureau secretaries who are concerned with matters of party work and socioeconomic policy in the RSFSR, chairmen of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the republic, and also other comrades. Let us consult and seek the best option so that the principle of people being appointed by virtue of their office [dolzhnostnoy printsip] does not prevail here and so that at the same time we have a sufficiently authoritative party body, capable of working efficiently.

We have also thought about the bureau's apparat and have concluded, analyzing past experience, comrades, that one should not create a special apparat but concentrate a section of the present CPSU Central Committee apparat on matters of the Russian Federation's party work. As a matter of fact it already deals with this today. We only need to outline and establish clearly the range of its obligations and the degree of its responsibility.

What do the highest priority tasks facing the Russian Bureau seem to be? Above all they are political tasks.

They are connected with the development of restructuring and democratic processes, with the consolidation in Russia of the system of genuine people's democracy of the soviets, and with increasing the vanguard role of Russian Federation party organizations. The bureau could periodically convene all-Russian party conferences on the most significant problems.

Furthermore, the bureau cannot stay on the sidelines of the development of economic policy on a republican scale, of the solution of tasks connected with the preparation of the transfer of the republic onto the rails of financial autonomy and economic independence. The main thing is that it is vital to make a resolute turn in the whole economic policy, which would lead to an improvement in the republic's economy, would guarantee the satisfaction of the essential demands of people and raising their standard of living and would radically improve the ecological situation.

One of the first tasks of the Central Committee Russian Bureau, the Supreme Soviet, and the republic's government should be setting up an efficient administration system, bearing in mind that Russia comprises major regions such as the Far East, Siberia, the Urals, the Volga Valley, the center, the northwest and the northern Caucasus.

All these are very large regions of the country. Their economic potential is frequently equivalent to that of entire states. Yet the administration of these large national economic complexes is overcentralized and continues to be conducted from Moscow, which of course harms their development and consequently also the country's development. The solution of this most important economic and political problem must clearly become one of the very first tasks of the Central Committee Russian Bureau, the Supreme Soviet, and the republic's government.

National and state construction in the RSFSR is also in need of serious improvement. This includes the expansion of the rights of autonomous republics, oblasts, and okrugs in all spheres of state, economic, and cultural construction. It also includes questions of setting up national regions in places where representatives of various nationalities live in compact units, and of strengthening friendship and cooperation between peoples residing in the republic.

Problems of the development of culture, education, and science, and of the preservation and augmentation of the historical and cultural heritage of all peoples of the Russian Federation, must lie at the center of attention of the Central Committee Russian Bureau. The activity of existing and new republican creative unions and associations and of other Russian structures is to be made more energetic.

Of course, comrades, it must be recognized that any organizational measures, even such major ones as the creation of the Central Committee Russian Bureau, cannot by themselves solve the entire complex of very acute and vital problems. however, There is no doubt that the step being proposed today will contribute to the RSFSR's more dyanmic socioeconomic and political development, and will serve the interests of the Russian people and of all peoples of the Russian Federation and our entire union.

I would ask you to speak out on the proposed measures so the plenum can adopt a corresponding decison after the discussion.

Russian Bureau Members Named

PM1012104189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report entitled: "CPSU Central Committee Plenum Resolution of 9 December 1989 on the Formation of a CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau"]

[Text] 1. In accordance with the CPSU plaform "The Nationalities Policy of the Party in the Present-Day Conditions," endorsed by the committee's plenum in September 1989, a Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee shall be formed.

The membership of the bureau is as follows:

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Bureau; Vitaliy Vorotnikov, president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and member of the Bureau;

Alexander Vlasov, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers and member of the Bureau; Boris Volodin, first secretary of the Rostov regional committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau; Boris Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Regional and City Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau;

Valentin Koptyug, vice-preisdent of the USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the Academy's Siberian branch and member of the Bureau; Anatoliy Korolev, a turners' team leader at the Uralsky heavy enginering plant named after Serbo Ordzhenikidze of the Uralmash Production Amalgamation of Sverdlovsk, and member of the Bureau;

Valentin Kuptsov, first secretary of the Vologda Regional Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau; Yuriy Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Bureau; Valentina Pletneva, a weaver at the Kostroma flax complex named after Lenin, and member of the Bureau;

Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau; Gumer Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Bureau; Gennadiy Khodyrev, first secretary of the Gorkiy Regional Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau;

Leonid Sharin, first secretary of the Amur Regional Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau; Oleg Shenin, first secretary of the Krasnoyarsk Territorial Committee of the CPSU and member of the Bureau; and Valentin Chikin, editor-in-chief of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and member of the Bureau.

2. The Bureau shall be entrusted with coordinating the activities of regional and territorial party organisations of the Russian Federation aimed at implementing the policy of the CPSU, and with monitoring the implementation of the decisions of congresses and conferences of the party, plenary meetings, and Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Bureau shall meet as the necessity arises but at least once a month. It shall pass resolutions that are binding on the party organisations of the Russian Federation.

In its practical activities the Central Committee's Russian Bureau shall rely on the existing staff of the CPSU Central Committee.

Gorbachev Allegedly Criticized, Threatens To Resign

AU1112104689 Paris AFP in English 1032 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec 11 (AFP)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has defended himself against accusations that he is power hungry saying "I can go", according to informed Estonian sources.

Speaking at Saturday's plenum of the Communist Party's Central Committee in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev rejected accusations that his policy of perestroyka was one for the West, according to Estonian Prime Minister Indrek Toome who attended the meeting.

Angered by the accusations, Mr. Gorbachev reportedly stood up saying: "If you think this way. Let's discuss this question. I'm not holding on to power".

In an interview broadcast on Estonian television Sunday, the republic's first secretary Vayno Vyalyas, who also attended the plenum said that faced with criticism from a grassroot Central Committee member, Mr. Gorbachev replied ironically: "If you don't like it, I can go."

Mr. Toome told Sunday's edition of the Estonian language VOICE OF YOUTH daily, that a number of speakers at the plenum had spoken out against the policy of perestroyka as put forward by the ruling Politburo.

As an argument, the speakers said "even the capitalist world was glad of the policy of perestroyka which should be a clear sign that we are mistaken", Mr. Toome reported.

The policies of glasnost and perestroyka were not for the outside, but to solve internal problems, Mr. Gorbachev reportedly said.

Vyalyas Denies Allegation

LD1112162989 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—"I did not say any of the phrases ascribed to me in the REUTERS report of my interview on Sunday with Estonian Television," Estonian Party Chief Vayno Vyalyas told TASS.

Vyalyas denied REUTERS allegation that he had reported that Gorbachev offered his resignation at the Plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee on Saturday [9 Dec].

"In my interview with Estonian Television," Vyalyas said, I spoke about the work of the plenum which discussed the progress of perestroika, political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union and the items on the agenda of the Second Congress of People's Deputies that opens on Tuesday. [quotation marks as received]

"Communists of Estonia," Vyalyas said, "fully support Gorbachev's policy of revolutionary transormations in Soviet society".

Ukraine's Ivashko Admitted to Politburo

LD0912195889 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—Vladimir Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee, was elected a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee at the committee's plenary meeting today.

Ivashko, 57, a Ukrainian, was born in Poltava. He graduated from the Kharkov Mining Institute, and began his working career in 1957. He has been a member of the CPSU since 1960.

He has a scientific degree of Candidate of Science (Economics). Ivashko has been engaging in party work since 1973. In September 1989 he was elected the first secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee.

Ivashko is a people's deputy of the USSR.

Background Given

PM1012185789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 89 Second Edition p1

[Unattributed pen portrait of new CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, Vladimir Antonovich Ivashko]

[Text] He was born in 1932 in the city of Poltava and is Ukrainian. He has been a member of the CPSU since 1960. He is a candidate of economic sciences and a lecturer. He graduated from the Kharkov Mining Institute. He began his working life in 1957, held lecture posts in higher education establishments in the city of Kharkov, and was elected secretary of the institute's party committee. In 1973 he became head of department and secretary of the Kharkov oblast party committee (obkom). In 1986 he was made secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. In 1987 he became first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk party obkom. In 1988 he was made second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. In September 1989 he was elected first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

In 1986-1989 he was candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee. He became a full member of the CPSU Central Committee in April 1989. He is a USSR people's deputy. He has been awarded the orders of the Labor Red Banner and Friendship of the People.

Medvedev Gives News Conference on Plenum

LD0912195189 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, described today's plenary meeting as an important political event, connected with the forthcoming Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Medvedev spoke at a news conference at the Foreign Ministry press centre at the end of the Soviet Communist Party plenum in Moscow.

Having noted that discussions at the plenum were substantive, Medvedev said the main issues were the forthcoming Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and formation of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum also considered nomination of candidates to people's deputies from the CPSU to fill a vacancy and set the date for election of the candidate from the CPSU.

It also examined the address of the CPSU Central Committee to the Soviet people and Communists in connection with the forthcoming elections to republican and local soviets.

Says Article 6 Subject to Change

LD0912235189 Moscow TASS in English 2302 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—The discussion of problems at today's plenum of the CPSU Central Committee passed in a businesslike atmosphere. Speeches were critical and self-critical, Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, told a news conference following a plenary meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Answering questions by journalists, Medvedev said that the plenum analysed the situation in the party and heard criticism, including against the Politburo, which was urged to act with more resolve, not to lag behind the course of events and not to let slip the initiative.

The secretary admitted that these criticisms were correct in principle because they reflected the objective need to move along the path of perestroyka more vigorously and rapidly.

He said that during the discussion of Nikolay Ryzhkov's report on socio-economic problems, which was approved on the whole, many proposals were made to move more rapidly to stabilise the Soviet economy.

Speaking about the attitude to Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, which enshrines the CPSU's leading role, Medvedev said that it was not a taboo subject. The country is going through a rapid process of political reform and changes in the party itself, which is being turned from the guiding nucleus of the state-political system into a political vanguard. The party intends to elaborate policy and offer it to people, to struggle for people's support for it and, on winning it, to try to realise it. Some wordings of the article already do not correspond to such view of the party's role, the secretary said, stressing the need for a serious conceptual attitude to changing the article. He denounced the desire to turn it into the subject of political speculations.

Medvedev spoke about the negative reaction of the participants in the plenum to the call by USSR People's Deputy Andrey Sakharov and some other deputies to hold a two-hour strike demanding to put the discussion of the issue on the agenda of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

This call was regarded at the plenum as deviation from a deputy's ethics. The question of Article Six was already discussed at the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and proposals are published for nationwide discussion. Therefore there is no need to put the issue on the agenda of the congress, circumventing the decision that was taken. Communists who joined Sakharov in signing the letter calling for a strike, Medvedev said, breached party ethics.

Answering a question on the forthcoming congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party, Medvedev spoke out in favour of a single international CPSU while seriously broadening the autonomy of Communist Parties of union republics. "I believe that the separation of a union Communist Party will produce illusory advantages but great losses," he said.

Speaking about the events in East European countries, the secretary stressed that Soviet Communists were not imposing their example of perestroyka on anyone. He expressed hope that the processes in those countries would lead to positive results.

Replying to questions by journalists, he also said that the issue of the two recent meetings in Leningrad was also raised at the plenum. Medvedev said that the meetings were not unequivocal. He said that First Secretary of the Leningrad Regional and City Party Committees Boris Gidaspov expressed his disagreement with the interpretation of the meeting by the press as an action aimed against the party Central Committee and the Politburo.

There was no special reaction to these two meetings at the plenum," Medvedev said.

Slyunkov Assesses Economy, Plenum Results

LD1012214189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1606 GMT on 10 December broadcasts the 32-minute "Political Tribune" program.

The "Political Tribune" program consists of an interview with Nikolay Nikitovich Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by political observer Viktor Beketov. The venue is not indicated, nor is any indication given as to whether the interview is live or recorded.

Beketov opens the interview, saying: "Nikolay Nikitovich, most acute issues of our econmy—meaning precisely those issues which you, as the chairman of the Central Committee Social and Economic Commission, are supervising—were examined at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that took place yesterday. Therefore, at the beginning of our conversation, I would like you to share with us briefly your impressions and thoughts on the plenum's results." Slyunkov replies: "The economy has been developing in an unsteady manner. Radical changes in increasing the economy's efficiency have failed to materialize and problems, especially social problems, require expenses. Hence, the state debt, the financial one, has started to grow lately. An especially complex situation has arisen in the consumer market. A shortage of food products, which have been in short supply in the country for a long time, has been compounded by shortages of many essential goods and consumer products. Therefore, these issues have brought about certain social tension. They are worrying society, and the party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the government are disturbed.

"Serious work is underway on these issues which is aimed at elaborating necessary measures in order to stabilize and normalize the situation. The government has prepared a number of proposals aimed at making the economy healthier, and at deepening and accelerating the economic reform. Basic proposals for shaping the 13th 5-year Plan have been studied. These issues were discussed seriously at the party Central Committee plenum. A whole range of constructive remarks and proposals for making the economy healthier was voiced. These proposals were adopted, and the government's proposals also were approved, in general. A proposal also was made for the government to submit these proposals to the Congress of People's Deputies. The issue will be continued, discussion of the measures will be continued at the Congress of People's Deputies, and a package of measures will make it possible to normalize the situation in the economy and on the consumer market at a quicker pace."

Beketov recalls the enthusiasm with which the Soviet people welcomed perestroyka and the ideas of the April plenum, and adds that almost five years later, people are becoming disillusioned. He asks for Slyunkov's views on the reasons for this. Slyunkov says: "It is very difficult to break up, all at once, the administrative and command-based system formed over many years, and it is even more difficult to transfer to economic methods of managing the economy because time is required not only to comprehend, but also to get onto a new footing in work. Therefore, new practice, new experience has to be acquired at work, in the economy. Therefore, of course, a certain amount of time is required. Well, to talk of the ultimate results and the effectiveness of this 5-year plan, then definite difficulties have become superimposed here. As a whole, it was planned in this 5-year plan to increase, to augment the national income by an absolute increase of R124 billion, but evidently, we will not achieve this figure. We will fail to obtain somewhere around R55 billion. In other words, in practice, the absolute growth of the national income will be the same as in the previous 5-year plan. What are the objective reasons? The interplay of forces of the market have changed, so we are selling much more oil this 5-year plan, but because of the cut in prices, we will have a shortfall in the national income of approximately R40 billion."

Chernobyl and the Armenian earthquake also caused economic problems, he adds, but nevertheless progress has been made toward developing the social sphere not, as before, on the principle of using surplus resources. He goes on: "The production of consumer goods since 1988 has been significantly outstripping the growth of means of production of Group A. The material base of the social sphere as a whole has been comprehensively strengthened, and I would say significanty, in housing construction, health care, education, and culture. If one looks at the housing problem, the increase will be significant. This 5-year plan, we will build 20 percent more housing than during the last 5-year plan."

Slyunkov says this is good progress and reiterates the planned figures of 900 million square meters of housing in the next 5-year plan and 1.1 billion square meters in the 14th 5-year plan, needed to implement the program of providing individual housing for all by the year 2000. He claims that existing disbelief in this program is groundless.

Beketov recalls the existence of the program for the production of consumer goods and the development of the service sphere, and asks how the existence of a program and the absence of goods is to be explained.

Slyunkov says: "Speaking about the program, the complex program of consumer goods and services, which was worked out and adopted in 1986, one has to say that it has completely lost its meaning because its scope and volume in no way corresponded to our needs and did not meet our requirements. Therefore, this program by itself receded as one not satisfying our needs. Measures now are being taken to expand the production of consumer goods. For this purpose, new capacities are not only being formed, but also created, and all industrial branches and enterprises in Group A which previously did not specialize in the production of consumer goods are becoming involved, without exception. Machine-building has been involved and the defense branch of industry has been involved.

"For this reason, the production and supply of goods to the market is growing. Even last year, R25 billion entered, the absolute increase was 25 billion. In the previous year, the increase was no more than R7-9 billion. This year, commodity resources worth approximately R30 billion will reach the shops and R40 billion next year. So those tasks that were at one point determined for the year 2000 have simply lost all meaning today. In other words, they were set far too low. Time has shown that serious corrections needed to be made and these corrections have been made now."

Beketov then brings up the issue of enterprises increasing the prices of goods so as to balance the books. Has this not played a role in creating the shortages and problems facing the country today? he asks.

Slyunkov agrees that such a phenomenon does exist. He says: "Many enterprises using financial autonomy, using the new economic management mechanism, have begun to improve their work and to increase labor efficiency, to create extra funds as a result of this, to solve their problems concerning the development of production, and to decide social matters and matters concerning their incomes. A certain proportion of enterprises have found niches for themselves so that by not investing or applying labor and without receiving the end results of labor, they find a means of obtaining profit precisely in such approaches. Therefore, I would say that many enterprises, particularly in such spheres as light industry and construction, and many design organizations of the State Construction Committee have begun to direct their efforts not toward increasing the performance, quality, and quantity of their work, but toward increasing prices and toward eroding goods that require considerably more investment but sell for less. They have begun doing this by means of shifts in range and structure. Thus, of course, they have become superimposed and have disrupted to a considerable extent the range that used to be in abundant supply at shop counters. Therefore, today it is necessary to take—and we are taking—resolute measures in order to curtail such tendencies."

Beketov inquires about regional financial autonomy, saying that many deputies and economists see it as the way out of the country's economic problems. He asks:

"To what extent do you consider the implementation of these ideas realistic, and to what extent will they put things right for us?"

Slyunkov replies: "I think this question cannot be examined apart from the general system of economic reform being conducted. First and foremost, you know that we began the reform, not with introduction of financial autonomy for regions or republics, but with changes to the economic mechanism, with the introduction of financial autonomy, with a definition of the economic mechanism and new methods directly where material values are formed, at the enterprises. Therefore, the basis for reforming the economy and for financial autonomy is the enterprise. Regions and regional financial autonomy are part of the general system, too. Of course, it also is a major part when republics and when regions will receive major economic independence, when those questions that can be decided better and more quickly on a territorial basis are decided on at that level. This is a correct policy: To conduct decentralization not only in economic management, but also in the economy, so that major global issues are decided at the center: Issues concerning restructuring of economic structures, major issues concerning the development of base industries. Those industries that can be administered better directly, on a territory basis, should go over to territorial administration."

Beketov says that extremes are dangerous in anything. Some economists are demanding that all state enterprises should go over to lease-contracting.

Slyunkov agrees that extremes are always a bad thing. Lease- contracting is a very progressive form of ownership. It is efficient and should be promoted broadly in the economy. Slyunkov adds: "But one should not contrast the lease-contracting form to other forms of ownership. All forms of ownership have a right to exist." This is why the different forms of ownership have been given equal opportunities in the draft law on ownership which has been published by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Slyunkov goes on to single out leasehold ownership, noting the importance of introducing this form of ownership in such sectors as light industry, the food processing sector, domestic services, and agriculture. Reiterating the importance of a variety of forms of ownership, he says: "There are views, speeches that say: Let's eliminate all the collective farms; let's eliminate all the large enterprises. Well, how can we today, while in motion, again using voluntarist methods and rule-by-decree methods, eliminate our large enterprises, metallurgical enterprises, machine-building enterprises? In principle, we favor putting an end to monopolism, but this process will take its course in time." He elaborates the same point with reference to the peasant economy, noting that the March plenum of the CPSU Central Committee provided broad opportunities for using all forms of ownership, depending on the specific conditions of a given region.

Beketov goes on to make the point that foreign models which do not correspond to Russian conditions are often adopted. Slyunkov replies: "I agree with you; I share this point of view. Some comrades, and I would even say economists, are trying to offer us some ready model, a model of some state, some system. There is no such model, and some model cannot be adopted and transferred, implemented in exchange for the model we have. However critically we might assess the state of the economy today, its past and present shortcomings, we must create only a model that is characteristic for use; only our own model can be created, based on the structure, on the realities we have, on the potential, on the psychology, on the possiblities, and on the level at which we find ourselves today. We must not skip any stage. We have to move ahead without permitting extremes."

"Underlining this point with examples, he goes on to say; "In the second place, we are implementing economic development, primarily preserving our socialist values. Herein lie certain complexities. We have not renounced, are not renouncing, and never will renounce our socialist gains and values, such as the right to work, to education, to a flat, to medical provision. So it would be possible—looking only at the economy, how to reform it as quickly as possible, how to conduct the market mechanisms as quickly as possible without taking the social consequences into account—it would be possible, of course, to implement certain maneuvers in the economy more quickly, but we will not embark on this. Primarily, at the focus of the whole of perestroyka, the renewal of society, and both economic reform and political reform, there are people. Everything is being done for the sake of people and their future. For this reason, we do not intend to depart from these values."

Beketov goes on to ask about the role of the party, with particular reference to the production sphere. Slyunkov replies: "Life, and our practice and searches over many years have led us to the profound conviction, profound conclusion, that we were committing very serious mistakes in imposing on the party the resolution of all the tasks, all the problems that surround us. This is beyond the party's power. For this reason, the party determined its position very precisely at its 19th conference: It is essential to divide the functions of leadership in the country. The party will concentrate on work involving the elaboration of policy, which the party will elaborate, propose to the people, and discuss with them, while handing the functions of economic management over to the state organs, the soviets, our soviet organs. For this reason, the party organizations at all levels must move away from the, perhaps, customary form of work that has arisen. Industrial enterprises and the problems that exist there with regard to technology, machinery, and organization, have to be managed by the relevant leaders, the relevant services. Party personnel should concern themselves with matters relating to work with people, with the masses, and should bring people to an awareness of the party's policies.

"We now are going over to new forms of work, to improving the economy, to introducing financial autonomy and new methods of running the economy. The party's field of activity today lies in taking the lead, in becoming a guide for the new economic policy. Cadres must be taught today, even psychologically. Today it is necessary to restructure cadres' thinking and attitude toward methods and forms of work in the collectives. It is necessary to involve and activate all our social institutions. It is necessary for the soviets to start operating, for the trade unions to start operating at their full capacity, for other social formations to begin operating, and for ideological work to be conducted. Therefore, in no case should we continue.... [changes thought] Whatever economic problem may arise, there are economic personnel to deal with it, and they are obliged to address such problems. They have to address them; they have to find solutions, while party personnel and organizations have to concern themselves with people."

Slyunkov goes on to reply briefly to a question regarding party organs at local level becoming involved in local economic affairs. Beketov finally asks Slyunkov, as chairman of the CPSU Central Committee's Commission on Socioeconomic Policies, what concept the commission will be taking to the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies, and how he sees further development in the economic sphere.

Slyunkov replies: "Our Commission on Socioeconomic Policies has also examined the proposals prepared by the government. We have discussed many of the problems that were not reflected in the program and in the proposals they have prepared now. The commission has passed its own proposals to the government. Yesterday, I also spoke at the Central Committee; I submitted a whole number of principled, constructive proposals that we consider will substantialy expand and supplement the possibilities for speeding up economic development and rendering our economy healthy.

"If we look at it from the point of view of stage-by-stage implementation, the stages look like this: First, 1990 is of very great significance. Very serious measures for stablizing the consumer market have been laid down for 1990. Normalization will not take place yet, but stabilization should take place; meaning we expect in our plans—and the Supreme Soviet has endorsed these plans—that money incomes and commodity resources should be balanced next year for the first time. Furthermore, in 1991 and 1992, the steps that have been mapped out in the measures will enable us to normalize the state of affairs on the consumer market, the budget, the state debt, and so forth. In 1993, we think—and we are convinced of this—the economy will start functioning stably and dynamically, and a serious change will get under way in our country's economy as a whole.

"In order for all our plans to become a reality, the thing we lack most of all at the present time, the thing we most need, is a calm atmosphere. It is necessary for this heatedness, these passions which are now occurring in society to be removed. Neither strikes, nor the preconditions for strikes, nor interregional and inter-ethnic conflicts promote perestroyka. The country needs a calm, confident work rythm now, as never before."

Congress of People's Deputies

Lukyanov Chairs Congress Preparatory Commission

LD0812212889 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—A session of the Commission on Preparations for the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies was held in Kremlin today and chaired by First Vice-President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov.

The commission, set up in accordance with the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, comprises over 80 people's deputies, representing all Soviet regions, social, professional and age groups.

Over the past four weeks, the commission, acting in a spirit of democratism and cooperation, has elaborated detailed proposals on the procedure and organisation and technical maintenance of the Second Congress.

The session listened to reports of subcommissions on the readiness of various services for the upcoming forum of the highest Soviet legislature.

It approved the subcommissions' proposals on the procedure, the composition of working bodies, organisational and technical maintainance and congress coverage in mass media.

Participants in the session noted that they have all grounds to report to the Supreme Soviet Presidium on the completion of preparations for the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies to open on December 12.

Congress To Promote Local Political Reform

LD0812120189 Moscow TASS in English 0909 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of Soviet People's Deputies which convenes on December 12 in the Kremlin is expected to pass new election laws designed to provide a legal groundwork for the new local management bodies.

The Soviet parliament passed the necessary amendments to the Soviet Constitution this autumn, taking a decision unprecedented in legislative practice: It allowed Soviet republics to change their election laws in accordance with the proposed amendments before their approval by the congress.

This opened the way for the second stage of political reforms—the setting up of new local legislatures after elections in December 1989-March 1990.

The bills give greater independence to Soviet republics in managing their electoral systems. Under these bills, each republic will be free to adopt its own procedures to elect chairmen of soviets, and can even decide to elect them directly.

Unlike the Soviet law on elections, the draft constitutional amendments do not reserve a third of seats in a legislature for public organisations. Public organisations will retain the right to nominate their candidates, but they will have to run in normal constituencies like everyone else.

Most Soviet republics have just began the election marathon, while some are nearing the finish: Latvia and Estonia will have local elections on Sunday.

It is too early to speak about the general trends of the new election campaing due to different time schedules and laws, but already the first reports in the soviet press are somewhat alarming.

In Kazakhstan, 73 percent of constituencies have only one candidate. In the Karaganda region alone, there are nearly 1,500 constituencies with only one person standing. This return to de facto elections is especially alarming since it will undoubtedly dampen electors' sentiments and activity.

All this is caused by a lack of attention to local elections and to information.

For instance, in Barnaul in western Siberia both electors and officials at the local soviets know little about nomination procedures, the IZVESTIYA newspaper reported recently.

Of course, the situation is not as bad elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

The Congress of People's deputies is expected to discuss these alarming reports when it convenes in the Kremlin.

'Stormy Debate' over Article 6 Foreseen

LD0912140189 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] The Congress of People's Deputies gathers in the Kremlin on 12 December for its second session. On the agenda of the highest legislative body in the land will be the numerous outstanding problems bedevilling this country, among them ways to revitalize the ailing economy and combating organized crime. But as the date of the congress approaches one issue seems to be obsessing society—the debates are ranging all over the Soviet Union—as to the future of Article 6 in the USSR Constitution, which actually perpetuates the Communist Party's leading role. This is what Mikhail Glebov writes.

The issue sparked off stormy debates in that parliamentary session which ended last week. As votes were split in the middle on whether or not to include the controversial article in the agenda of the congress, the issue was dropped. But a group of members of parliament who lost out in parliament have decided to call on the public for a 2-hour general strike to get the congress to put the issue on its agenda.

Reports say the appeal, signed by Drs Sakharov, Tikhonov, Popov, (?Voroshov), Chernichenko, and Afanasyev, was met with mixed response. But further reports alleging that there was foul play around the statement added to the already-high emotions, and even more so when one of the signatories, Yuriy Chernichenko, made it clear he heard about it from a radio report and that he was opposed to the strike.

The debate was fuelled further after word emerged that parliament in the Baltic Republic of Lithuania had decided to delete the article on the party's leading role from its own constitution. A federal state is usually run on the supremacy of central laws, and Lithuania's decision gives rise to extra headache.

The issue of Article 6 will no doubt emerge at the congress, and some ministers [as heard] of parliament have already said in newspaper and television interviews that they would insist it should be included in the agenda—but it is hard to say if the motion would summon the necessary support at the congress. Votes were halved at the parliamentary session, and opinion polls in Moscow speak of a similar situation at the ground level. Many believe extra noise over the issue is uncalled for and could lead to a heightening of social tensions. They say the need for constitutional amendments, including Article 6, has already been discussed by the parliamentary Constitution Commission, which is still working over relevant proposals. There are also arguments against the issue being discussed immediately on the grounds of the need for considering it within the framework of overall changes to the Constitution rather than take a hasty decision. The reformists meanwhile say party reform is lagging behind that of society.

Whichever way it works out, even the first hours of the congress on Tuesday hold promises of a stormy debate.

'Thousands' Meet in Moscow To Mark Congress

LD1012102889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] In Moscow at this very moment, a meeting of public organizations, in which many thousands of people are taking part, is taking place on the square near the VDNKh [North Moscow Permanent Exhibition] of the USSR. The meeting is being held in connection with the Congress of People's Deputies, which is about to open, and with the Day of Human Rights which is being celebrated today.

Deputies' Registration for Congress Continues

LD1012235489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] The registration of people's deputies of the USSR, who are arriving for the Second Congress which will open on 12 December, is continuing today in the Kremlin. Let me remind you that nine questions are being put forward for consideration: The most important among them are amendments and additions to the constitution on matters of the electoral system and concerning draft legislative acts that determine the status of people's deputies and the election of a committee for constitutional supervision. The government report on measures to make the economy more healthy is also to be discussed.

Congress Credentials Committee Meets

LD1012131489 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—The Credentials Commission of the Congress of People's Deputies held a meeting in the Kremlin today. Examining the credentials of newly elected legislators, the commission noted that the elections of the deputies were held in compliance with the USSR Constitution and the USSR Law on the Elections of People's Deputies.

The commission decided to submit a proposal for the consideration of the 2nd Congress of People's Deputies to recognise the credentials of newly elected people's deputies.

Gorbachev Chairs Meeting of People's Deputies

LD1112121889 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—A meeting of representatives of the groups of people's deputies, chaired by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, was held in the Kremlin today.

The meeting examined questions concerning the 2nd Congress of People's Deputies.

Congress To Be Given 'Wide Coverage'

LD1112060989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Report by Nikolay Neyeh]

[Text] Tomorrow the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies opens. Its work will of course be given wide coverage on the Central Television and All-Union Radio network. I too have been made a member of the team of journalists granted this opportunity, and therefore I want to tell you that in accordance with the decisions of the commission for preparing the congress—this was set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium—direct relays of the opening and closing of the congress are planned on First and Second Television and Radio programs through the Orbita and Vostok program systems. Recordings of all sessions of the congress will be relayed daily, starting from 1500 GMT on the Second Program of Central Television, and on the Second Program—our Mayak, that is—of All-Union Radio. Brief reports on the main events of each day of the Congress' work will be broadcast on the Vremya programs and Latest News bulletins. The length of these programs will be increased to 1 hour.

You can watch and listen to reports from the sessions, commentaries, interviews, and other material connected with the work of the congress in the "Morning Panorama" on Mayak, of course, and also on "Seven Days," "120 Minutes," "Good Evening Moscow!" "Vzglyad," "Rural Hour," "Soyuz," "Land and People," and "Yunost" programs.

In short, journalists from all the radio and television departments will be dealing with this, but I would like to draw viewers' and listeners' attention to the fact that the schedule for broadcasts from the sessions of the Second Congress, which was examined by the preparatory commission, is not final. The congress itself nevertheless has the last word in this respect. We shall, of course, announce any possible changes in the broadcasting schedule both of television and radio.

TV Weekly Outlines Congress Coverage

LD0912191189 Moscow GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA in Russian Dec 89 Issue No 50 p 2

[Excerpts] The country awaits the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies. There is enormous interest in it. This weekly's editorial office is constantly being asked how central television and all-union radio will be covering the work of the forthcoming congress. We asked Petr Nikolayevich Reshetov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Television and Radio Committee, to talk about this. [passage omitted]

Reshetov said the commission considered it possible to establish the following order of coverage of the work of the forthcoming congress:

Live coverage of the opening and closing of the congress is envisioned on the first and second all-union television and radio channels, on the "Orbita" systems, and the "Vostok" channel.

All sittings of the congress will be transmitted from recordings every day from 1500 GMT on the second channel of central television and the second channel of All-Union Radio.

For the Eastern regions of the country the congress sittings will be transmitted from recordings: on double three and double four of central television second channel from 1300 GMT, on double one and double two the morning sittings will be transmitted from 1030 GMT and the evening ones will be transmitted on the following day from 0600 GMT.

A brief report of the main events of each day will be seen by television viewers in the "Vremya" newscast. On the days of the congress's work its length will be increased to one hour. Besides reports of the congress days, reports, commentaries, and the reactions of Soviet and world public opinion to what is happening in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses are planned in the "Vremya" newscast. [passage omitted]

I want to draw the attention of readers of the weekly to the following circumstance. The order of transmissions of the sitting of the second congress, studied by the commission for its preparation, is so far not the definitive one. The last word in this regard remains with the congress itself. It alone will finally decide what the television and radio transmissions from the congress will be.

You will be informed beforehand of all possible changes in the transmissions by the announcers of Central Television and All-Union Radio.

Supreme Soviet

Gorbachev Chairs Presidium Meeting on 2d Congress

LD1112101289 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet met in the Kremlin today under the chairmanship of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to consider arrangements for the work of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The Presidium discussed proposals connected with the agenda and procedure of the Second Congress and referred them to a meeting of representatives of groups of USSR People's Deputies for consideration.

The Presidium summed up the results of the work of its commission for the preparation of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Supreme Soviet's Political Divisions Described

LD0812174289 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—By TASS analyst Boris Prokhorov:

The last document approved by the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet—the bill on leaves—was published in the Soviet press on Thursday.

In addition to the laws on the economic independence of the Baltic republics and on leaseholding, earlier adopted by the Soviet parliament, the public will now be able to read the bills on the press, on land and on leaves submitted for popular discussion. These documents are unquestionably very important and are bound to affect the country's future social development.

The fact that such legislations have been adopted or approved in the first reading proves the efficiency of the present Soviet parliament and its deputies. It really is a new Supreme Soviet.

However, the press and the television, as well as ordinary people, often complain about the liberalism or conservatism of this or that deputy. Some are accused of "rightwing" and others of "leftwing" tendencies.

But what then is the real pattern of the new Supreme Soviet? The answer is very simple. Our parliament is made up of diverse people who adhere to different, frequently diametrically opposed views. The new Supreme Soviet is a mirror of Soviet society that includes impatient, sometimes aggressive perestroyka supporters, more moderate people, and even outright opponents of the reforms or persons indifferent to them.

Let's not be dogmatic or naive. Let's not try to convince anyone or ourselves that there is "monolithic unity" in the perestroyka process. Everybody now understands that changes are needed, but different people have different views on how they should be carried out.

This is why differing, sometimes absolutely opposite views can be heard at Supreme Soviet sessions. This is perfectly natural. Nevertheless, deputies must have enough wisdom, despite their differences, to seek compromises and mutual concessions in order to reach agreed, mutually acceptable decisions. The businesslike atmosphere of our parliament favours this.

Summing up the results of the second session, Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said: "The spirit of free discussion dominates our Supreme Soviet today. Nobody will dare say that he is being led on a leash. The curtailment of discussions will not promote consolidation..."

The way towards efficient decisions lies through dialogue, discussions and even disputes. This is why the presence of "leftists" and "rightists" in Soviet parliament now frightens only shortsighted people. Others acclaim the existing diversity of views and opinions as a precondition for the elaboration of decisions that suit everybody.

The extremely important documents adopted, although not without difficulty, by the second session of Soviet parliament show that such preconditions are being ensured in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Soviet Parliament To Broaden Political Contacts

LD0812135889 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—A plan of international relations of the Soviet parliament has the aim of broadening inter-parliamentary contacts as a component part of the Soviet state's foreign policy activity. The plan was endorsed at a meeting of the Soviet parliament's International Affairs Committee today.

To promote new political thinking and assist the USSR's foreign policy actions should be the main area of the Supreme Soviet's activities, Aleksandr Dzasokhov, acting committee chairman, said.

Special attention should be paid to consolidating the priority of human values, disarmament and cooperation in solving mankind's global problems, Dzasokhov believes.

It is necessary to establish relations with the parliaments of Asian and Pacific states. Soviet parliamentary delegations could visit a number of Persian Gulf and Caribbean Basin countries with which the Soviet Union so far has no diplomatic relations.

Primakov Chairs Privileges Commission Meeting

LD1012223489 Moscow TASS in English 2208 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission on privileges for some categories of citizens met here on Sunday under the chairmanship of Yevgeniy Primakov.

The session heard the information of the USSR Council of Miisters on normalizing the use of office cars and took into account that in accordance with the government resolution of January 23, 1988 work had been done to reduce th number of office cars. In the union ministries and departments, for instance, their number was cut by 600 cars and amounts presently to 1,400. However, more than 70 per cent of office cars are at the disposal of profit-and-loss accounting enterprises and organisations which are not regulated from the centre.

The commission supported the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers calling for ending the supplies of office cars to the bodies of government.

At the same time it was stressed that the previously planned supplies of cars should be redirected to the Interior Ministry agencies for operational work in combatting crimes and to health services.

To improve the use of office cars, the commission recommended to state and public organisations to specify the lists of officials entitled to personal cars and establish time limits for the state-paid use of cars by officials, so that the use of office cars beyond these limits should be paid by the officials in cash. Officials were also recommended to drive their office cars themselves.

The USSR Supreme Soviet commission on privileges has begun the consideration of the question about so-called personal pensions.

Political & Social

Moscow Human Rights Day; 2-Hour Strike

Demonstrations on Article 6

LD1012183189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Aleksandr Borisov reports:

Despite the temperature of 20 below, hundreds of Muscovites and inhabitants of other towns of the USSR took part in the demonstration and meeting that took place today in Moscow dedicated to human rights day. In an orderly column they proceeded from the Olympic Sports Complex in the center of the city to the square in front of the entrance to the exhibition of the achievements of the USSR national economy (VDNKH) in the northern part of the city—one of the busiest areas of the capital—where a meeting took place, which like the demonstration, was permitted by the city authorities. Participating in them were representatives of almost all Moscow's public organizations and informal associations, the number of which has considerably grown in recent years. Among them were "the Soviet association for assistance to the united nations," the movement "for freedom and democracy," "April," and the Moscow and Russian popular fronts.

Over almost 2 hours USSR peoples' deputies, representatives of labor collectives from various cities around the country, public organizations, and informal associations came to the tribunal one after another. Their speeches demonstrated, very likely, the general interest in the quickest possible solution of the problems standing in the path of perestroyka in the USSR, and in overcoming the difficulties of the present stage of the development of Soviet society.

Speakers called for the (?acceleration) of the processes of democratization in the country, and expressed serious concern at the resistance by the bureaucratic apparatus to the process of transformations. Various and at times mutually exclusive positions were expressed on the issue of the fate of article 6 of the USSR Constitution which defines the leading role of the CPSU, and on the call by a number of people's deputies to hold a 2-hour political strike tomorrow on the eve of its 2d congress.

A resolution adopted, in particular, contains a call for the acceleration of legal reform, and for the provision of guarantees of the inalienable rights and freedoms of citizens.

Despite the wide range of views of those who took part, the contentiousness, and, at times the excessive sharpness in appraisals, the meetings at the VDNKH passed in a calm and organized manner, which cannot be said of the action by the Democratic Union (DU). A few dozen of its representatives, seeking, apparently, to draw more attention to themselves, ignored the suggestion of the authorities to hold the demonstration in another place (the traditional place for such events at the Luzhniki stadium was suggested to the DU) and organized it on Pushkin Square, where the holding of mass demostrations is prohibited since this disrupts traffic in the very center of the city.

At the unique "performances" of the DU, the behavior of those taking part, having the nature of challenge, has already become traditional. So it was this time also. Placards bore openly extremist wording, denigrating the honor and worth of members of the Communist Party, and containing direct threats to them.

After repeated calls to clear the square, and not to hamper vehicle traffic, at 1700 Moscow time [1400 GMT] the militia arrested about 20 people whose hooligan behavior had been particularly audacious for the violation of public order.

However, it should be noted that the efforts of the "democrats" to draw attention to themselves yield fewer results with each occasion. Passers-by barely glancing at the unfolded placards and having understood what was going on, walked past.

PRAVDA: 'Provocative, Offensive' Slogans

PM1112140989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Latest 'Show' in Pushkin Square"]

[Text] The bronze of Pushkin looked down in confusion on the young people clambering over his pedestal. For they had come here 10 December not with the usual flowers but with home-made placards and banners....

The slogans on the banners, as is traditional at "shows" staged by the so-called Democratic Union, were provocative and offensive. The banners even carried slogans disparaging the honor and dignity of Communists and outright threats against them. Waving imperial tricolor flags, the crowd chanted provocative slogans. It must be said that only half of the 500 people who gathered at 1500 outside the MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI editorial building for an unsanctioned rally were present beside the monument to the great Russian poet.

The previous day the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee [Gorispolkom] had examined an application from Democratic Union representatives to hold a rally in Pushkin Square on Human Rights Day. The adopted decision instructed the organizers to hold the meeting at a venue well-known to Muscovites—Square No 1 at Luzhniki. However, the Democratic Union leaders preferred to engage in confrontation and thereby draw attention to themselves—primarily from foreign correspondents. Naturally, pictures were shown to great effect on foreign screens of a special-purpose militia detachment breaking up these provocations.

After repeated calls to move away from the monument and leave the square in order to stop blocking the traffic and impeding pedestrians, at 1600 a special-purpose militia detachment started carrying out its duties. The militia acted precisely and properly. Major General of the Militia N. Myrikov, deputy chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom State Internal Affairs Administration, reported that by 1700 around 20 people, whose hooligan behavior was particularly outrageous, had been arrested for violating public order.

Further on Protest

LD1012180489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] A meeting dedicated to the anniversary of the declaration of human rights took place today in Moscow on the square in front of the main entrance to the USSR VDNKH [North Moscow Permanent Exhibition]. Hundreds of people came despite the temperature of 20 degrees below.

People's deputies of the country, representatives of labor collectives, of various public organizations, and of unofficial associations spoke to those assembled. The ardent desire to help the processes toward democratization and concern that the bureaucratic apparat is still actively opposing these processes, were heard in the speeches.

Demonstration Opposes CPSU Monopoly

AU1012155889 Paris AFP in English 1452 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, Dec 10 (AFP)—Several thousand demonstrators Sunday braved freezing cold here to demand the abolition of a constitutional article enshrining the Soviet Communist Party's monopoly on power, witnesses said. The demonstrators demanding the abolition of Article 6, which defines the party's leading role in society, gathered at the Olympic stadium in central Moscow for the rally organised by several unofficial movements.

TASS news agency said the demonstration took place to mark International Human Rights Day.

Mr. Gorbachev on Saturday dismissed demands from radical deputies for a parliamentary debate on abolishing article 6 at the next session of the Congress of People's Deputies opening on Tuesday.

Despite the biting cold with temperatures close to minus 20 degrees centigrade, the demonstrators marched to the park of socialist achievements situated several kilometres away, carrying banners with Article 6 crossed out. Some brandished Russian and Ukrainian nationalist flags marked "down with imposters". Other banners expressed support for Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, urging him not to yield to party conservatives, and many held up photographs of party radical Boris Yeltsin.

Police Break Up Democratic Union Rally

AU1012160689 Paris AFP in English 1542 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, Dec 10 (AFP)—Several thousand demonstrators Sunday braved freezing cold here to demand the abolition of a constitutional article enshrining the Soviet Communist Party's monopoly on power, witnesses said.

At least one person was meanwhile injured when riot police broke up a separate demonstration in Moscow's Pushkin Square organised by the anti-communist Democratic Union, journalists said. About 10 people were taken in for questioning at the Democratic Union rally attended by 300-400 people and called to denounce Soviet human rights violations on International Human Rights Day.

Moscow authorities have banned demonstrations in Pushkin Square.

But the demonstrators demanding the abolition of Article 6, which defines the party's leading role in society, were allowed to gather at the Olympic Stadium in central Moscow for their rally organised by several unofficial movements. [Passage omitted]

Gorbachev Pictures Reportedly Burned

LD1012175989 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1730 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Pictures of Gorbachev have been burned in the Soviet capital. You will hear Tamas Frey:

[Frey] The bonfire was made by the organization calling itself Democratic Alliance, which is officially described as antiregime, and what is more, it was in the framework of a mass demonstration. This is how the members of the organization wished to protest against the alleged trampling of human rights in the Soviet Union and that is why they burned the portrait of Gorbachev, whom they consider a dictator.

Not even Lenin escaped the wrath of the mass of some 1,500 people. His portrait, however, was not burned, but torn into pieces and then trodden on.

The several hundred-strong white helmeted storm division of the forces of order, already well known from earlier demonstrations, watched and listened peacefully for half an hour to the extreme and rough action of the Democratic Alliance. After half an hour had elapsed, however, the division received a command to disperse the crowd, which the several hundred-strong unit, with practiced movements, arresting at least 30 of the ringleaders, carried out in barely 10 minutes. The TASS news agency has not yet reported the event. movements. [passage omitted]

Report of Gorbachev Offer To Resign 'Not True'

LD1112115689 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1100 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [Announcer] This morning the REUTERS NEWS AGENCY flashed a sensation to the world, but shortly afterwards it turned out that the report was not so much a sensation, but a well-fattened canard. Gabor Izbeki, reporting from Moscow, has the details.

[Izbeki] The news issued by REUTERS that Gorbachev wanted to resign at Saturday's [9 December] Central Committee session is not true, and such a thing had not even by alleged by Vayno Vyalyas, the Estonian Party leader, in the interview he gave last night to Tallinn TV.

The journalist who presented the interview, (Mati Talvik), told Hungarian Radio on the telephone that at the Central Committee session there was indeed a sharp debate. [passage omitted]

Mati Talvik, the Estonian journalist, has stated decisively that nobody from Estonian Television had telephoned REUTERS to report the news of Gorbachev's intention to resign. REUTERS does not know, either, who it was who telephoned. This has already been looked into at Estonian Television. The staff member of Estonian Television described the anonymous telephone caller quite simply as a provocateur, but he did not go into the question of what purpose the caller might have had. [passage omitted]

Leningrad Rally Backs Gorbachev, CPSU

PM1112111589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 p 1

[Correspondent S. Razin report under the rubric "Every Day in This Spot": "Rally After a Rally"]

[Text] On 6 December more than 40,000 Leningrad residents went to a rally and supported the policy of radical changes.

Two weeks ago, when quite different slogans calling for emergency measures to stabilize the political situation in the country had been spotlighted in the same snow-covered square, in front of the Lenin sports and concert complex, many people of Leningrad—and not only they—felt alarm. Were there people in Leningrad who could declare a different, more democratic platform? The answer to this question was given exactly 3 days later, 25 November, when Communists of the city Party Club—it unites workers and intelligentsia from more than 100 Leningrad enterprises—applied to hold an alternative rally. This demand was supported by the Leningrad People's Front and a number of other public organizations. The alternative rally received official authorization. However, the previously announced time for holding it was brought forward by 30 minutes—without coordination with the organizing committee—which fact was suddenly reported by LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA on the day of the rally. Who needed this maneuver, and why, came to light in the evening in the square itself, when hired buses rolled up at the square one after another and a distinctive audience in good-quality hats gathered in "the stalls," in front of the rostrum itself. Probably 2,000-3,000 people gathered.

However, that ruse proved pointless. Thousands upon thousands of Leningraders were gravitating toward the rally from all sides—from the subway and from streetcar and trolleybus stops.

There was a sense of relief when searchlight beams picked out the multitude of slogans from the darkness: "Let Us Create a Democratic CPSU Platform!" "A Market Economy Against Poverty!" "We Support Gorbachev!" "Where Is Your Word, Rank-and-File Communists!" "We Will Not Let the Peasants Be Cheated!" and "Whoever Is for Socialism Is with the CPSU!"

What was spoken of?

"In a recent interview B.V. Gidaspov accused the top echelon of the party leadership of looking on detachedly as socialist ideals are being eroded and people are being deceived with sweet fairytales about popular capitalism, infinite democracy, and nonparty glasnost... This is a convenient stance for a party apparatus that does not wish to share power with the people. It saddens me to see that Leningrad's party leader understands the party's directing role in just this way..." USSR People's Deputy Yu. Klepikov said in his speech.

Many speakers criticized B.V. Gidaspov, and people spoke anxiously, sharply, and at times in a hard-hitting way. But, despite such stern assessments, people did not speak of this because they wanted to find one more enemy of perestroyka. It seemed to me that after several such speeches Boris Veniaminovich himself approached the microphone not in order to justify himself and not because he considered himself offended but because he was ready to accept what was fair in that criticism and to heed the voice of the people of Leningrad.

"I am very pleased to see you all here together, despite the fact that we all hold different views. I see the placards: 'Boris, you are wrong!' But I consider that I am right! I am sure that through joint efforts we will achieve good party results. I address you on the threshold of elections. We need our soviets to be joined by people who are clever, competent, honest..." Gidaspov said from the rostrum, but his speech could hardly be heard over the chanting of many thousands of people: "Resign! Resign!"

However, I believe that rally emotions are not grounds for adopting any important decisions. If democratization in the party is a reality, then ordinary Communists must have their say and, of course, not at a rally but at party meetings, after discussing the specific action program in a calm and considered manner. And such calls have been heard least noticeably of all in the cacophony of rallies.

"I urge Leningrad Communists to support the demand to hold an extraordinary oblast party conference, for I want to express my position through delegates elected by direct ballot and not to learn of my opinion in the morning newspapers," the whole square applauded Aleksandr Potekhin, member of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] oblast committee.

I will point out in passing that the political rating of the Leningrad Komsomol, if such a thing were determined, would be high now. The whole city is observing an unprecedented phenomenon: The Komsomol oblast committee is openly swimming "against the tide."

"As a Communist, I have the right to say that the party cannot aspire to the leading role in society until there is democracy in the party itself," Dmitriy Greys, a worker at the "Kirovskiy Zavod," enunciated his every word clearly in the frost.

Of course, it was not hard to judge from the reaction of the rally participants their attitude toward those who asked to speak—as is customary, they applauded some in a friendly way and greeted others tumultuously. But, all the same, the people gave everyone who asked to speak an opportunity to do so and heard out all the speakers—representatives of the Democratic Union, oblast party committee workers, people's deputies, ordinary Communists, officers, and journalists alike. Although this time the microphone in the square was not equipped with expensive brand-name amplifiers, on the other hand it was really free.

"I appeal to you, people of Leningrad! We must not allow a 'wall against wall' situation. We must understand each other. We must support the democratic platform and unite our efforts," G. Bogomolov, a worker at Lenpoligrafmash, appealed to his fellow citizens.

From the rostrum I saw how the resolution of this protest rally was adopted unanimously.

"We people of Leningrad, Communists and nonparty people, participants in a citywide rally 6 December 1989, declare our support for the policy of radical political and economic reforms. We welcome the desire of Gorbachev, Yakovlev and their supporters in the party leadership to impart a humane nature to our society, to return the country to the mainstream of general human civilization...."

Medvedev on Rally

LD1012195889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program, presented by Aleksandr Tikhomirov]

[Text] [Tikhomirov] Of course, there was the party plenum that took place yesterday, the event of events. You have already heard news reports about it throughout the day and no doubt many of you have already had time to read Comrade Gorbachev's speech in the papers and, as has been happening fairly often of late, apprehension proved to be in vain. Rumors were not confirmed. What rumors? Rumors like these: [video cuts to evening meeting showing slogans such as "Sobchak is with the people? Whose side is Gidaspov on?" "Boris, you're wrong", "Borya plus Nina equals love", "Sukharev and Co.: a disgrace to the country", "Article 6" crossed out, "we support the IDG" [Interregional Deputies' Group], "Down with the art of juggling the facts", "Get TV out from under the heel of the party apparatus", "Gorbachev is reliability", "We Communists are against the power of the apparatus, Article 6, lack of accountability and demagogy." The speaker quoted has an old Russian flag from pre-1914 days flying above his head]

[Unidentified male speaker] Analysis of recent events gives me grounds to suspect that a plot is ripening here under the leadership of Yegor Ligachev with the aim of throwing Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev out of office by the time of the approaching CPSU plenum. [applause and catcalls] What is Ligachev doing in Tyumen other than allegedly dealing with the problems of western Siberia? We can and will criticize Gorbachev. But, now, we cannot allow him to be overthrown. This must not happen.

[Tikhomirov] This was a meeting held this week in Leningrad or, to be more precise, a countermeeting against the one that was held 2 weeks ago. Both were organized by members of the city's party organization but at the first they—and that includes Boris Gidaspov, the obkom first secretary—putting it simply, criticized the Central Committee and the Politburo more and more, while at the second meeting it was the oblast and city committees of Leningrad, including Boris Gidaspov, that were criticized.

At yesterday evening's news conference on the work of the plenum, I put the following question to Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev. [video shows journalists in their seats, Medvedev and Gerasimov on the platform, Tikhomirov, microphone in hand, putting his question to the rostrum]

[Begin recording] [Tikhomirov] Tell us please whether the matter was raised at the plenum of the two somewhat strange meetings that took place in Leningrad, which have been perceived by the public in the following way: the first as anti-Gorbachev and the second pro-Gorbachev; and whether the spirit of these meetings, the first or the second, was reflected in the speeches at the plenum?

[Medvedev] Comrade Gidaspov's speech reproduced and explained the basic provisions of the document that was adopted at the united plenum of the oblast and city committees of the party. In this connection, he also spoke about the meeting and touched upon the reaction to the meeting that followed, especially in the press. He does not agree with the interpretation of the meetings in the press as actions that were aimed critically against the party Central Committee and the Politburo. He spoke of the fact that while, of course, they do also have their own analytical, so to speak, approaches to the work of the party and the Central Committee, the Leningrad party organization fully backs the policy of restructuring and the practical work that is being done in that direction by the Central Committee and the Politburo. As for my own attitude toward the first meeting, I can repeat that I think it requires an uncategorical appraisal. On the one hand, it is impressive that the communists of one of the largest organizations are, as they say, coming out of the trenches and comrade Gidaspov said today that we had come out onto the parapets. People are stopping, sitting it out in their offices, coming onto the streets, and going into the thick of things. They express their point of view openly and defend it. In my opinion, this is a good sign and an indication that the Leningrad party organization does have both specific reserves and forces, and the desire, the aspiration, to rectify the situation in the wake of the serious failure it suffered at the elections for people's deputies.

At the same time—and I am not concealing this—I am talking in this instance of the meeting and not of the platform adopted by Leningrad's oblast and city committees—from my point of view, this platform is sufficiently positive and considered, although there, too, there is material for discussion and debate—but at the meeting certain motifs were expressed, which, naturally, evoke both objections and a desire to engage in serious debate with those who spoke.

I think that the other meeting also merits an uncategorical appraisal. There, too, there was much that was correct, including the fact that support for the Central Committee and for the party was much to be heard; but at the same time, this other thing, the fact that there was such sharp and merciless criticism directed against the Leningrad party organization, here too the due measure was no doubt not always observed in everything. A meeting, however, is a meeting, and here, no doubt, one cannot bring this living work within some kind of rigid framework. It is active work and we must react calmly to it, as to a meeting. [end recording]

[Tikhomirov—in the studio] Vadim Andreyevich spoke in a fairly detailed way about the course of the plenum but he forgot to answer to what degree the views of the conservatives and the, let's call them, reformists clashed at yesterday's plenum, as they did at the meetings in Leningrad. Or perhaps, he didn't want to. But that is a shame.

Moskvichev Lauds 'Objective' Reporting

PM0612110189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[V. Nikolayev report: 'Academics' Responsibility"]

[Text] On 28-30 November 1989 an all-union conference of the leaders of the specialized councils on philosophical sciences, organized by the USSR Higher Certification Commission, was held in Leningrad. Professor L.N. Moskvichev, chairman of the USSR Higher Certification Commission, gave a report on the restructuring of the USSR Higher Certification Commission's work and the new requirements for the specialized councils, which are to conduct examinations of doctorate and candidate dissertations. Particularly important is the new range of problems being investigated in dissertations—which increases the responsibility of the specialized councils for the quality, high scientific level, and practical significance of dissertation research.

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor A.V. Vorontsov, chief of the Ideological Department of Leningrad Oblast and City Party Committees, informed the conference participants about the Leningrad Communists' platform and letters from various regions expressing approval of the platform, and he stressed that the most objective portrayal of events in Leningrad was to be found in the columns of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Representatives of the specialized councils from Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Rostov-na-Donu, Kharkov, Minsk, Tashkent, and other cities participated in the discussion. They examined the problems developed in dissertations and put forward constructive proposals to improve the activity of the specialized councils and the work of the USSR Higher Certification Commission.

Leningrad Plenum Rejects 'Production Okrugs'

PM0412115189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent V. Nevelskiy: "Session Said 'No'"]

[Text] Leningrad—The press has frequently published reports claiming that the Leningrad people, the first to put forward the idea of holding elections to the local soviets on the basis of production okrugs, actively support this idea and are ready for this experiment. A joint plenum of the Leningrad Oblast and City Party Committees refuted these claims at the outset. The Leningrad party organization platform adopted by the plenum states that the Communists reject this undemocratic idea, whose aim is a return to dicatorship.

Nonetheless a group of deputies from the Leningrad City Soviet representing the United Front of Working People demanded that an extraordinary session of the Leningrad City Soviet be convened.

And it has taken place. The result of this session was not unexpected. Only 16 votes out of 401 were cast in support of the experiment with production okrugs.

The Leningrad people have proved once again that they are far from being as conservative as the defenders of the United Front of Working People's dubious undertaking tried to present them.

Leningrad's Gidaspov Outlines Local Progress

PM0211145189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 First Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy B. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Party Oblast Committee and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by Colonel V. Streltsov: "Rely On Common Sense"—date and place not specified]

[Text] [Streltsov] Boris Veniaminovich, you have been first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee [Obkom] for just a few months now. I know for a fact that during that brief time Leningraders have been able to appreciate your drive, as it were, your energy. They say that no 2 days pass without your visiting some enterprise, institution, or kolkhoz. How do you personally view the situation there, in labor collectives? Is there the confidence that the transfer to regional economic accountability, which Leningraders now advocate, will produce the desired results in the very near future both in the economy and the social sphere?

[Gidaspov] Let us begin by saying that the party obkom now feels considerable support from Leningraders for the undertakings planned in the city and the oblast. Undertakings planned, I emphasize, not by the will of the obkom or, as they say, "from above," but precisely thanks to the initiatives of different sections of the population. Incidentally, it is with some annoyance that I have to say that we missed the first wave of perestroyka sentiment, if I may put it that way: We failed to take advantage of it or to consolidate it in organizational ways. As a result, there were lots of speeches and appeals, but in many cases no progress. Furthermore, in some places things came to a standstill. Now the feeling of the vast majority of people—in the city and the countryside, in industry and science—may be characterized in these terms: less talk, more action. This can be felt very much at meetings. People are work-minded. But to ensure that this work succeeds, it is necessary once more to tackle a very complex set of questions: organizational, material-technical, transport, and other questions.

As for regional economic accountability, I support it unreservedly. This is an economic lever, one of the main ones, capable of improving many things. But one should not think here that the introduction of economic accountability will be quick and smooth. While seeing the positive aspects of the idea as a whole, one must also bear in mind that it also contains certain negative tendencies. Unfortunately, the tendency toward a closed cycle of "production and consumption" and the desire to rely on self-financing alone could lead to isolationism and a lack of coordination at the region-to-region and republic-to-republic levels. That is why now, when creating the concept of regional economic accountability, we are paying special attention to elaborating such forms of cooperation as those between enterprises within a region, between the enterprise and the region, and also between a region and the country. Without such a cycle the introduction of regional economic accountability will merely lead to new economic and social difficulties.

[Streltsov] Indeed, recently Soviet people have been quite frequently hearing far from rosy predictions about the country's emergence from crisis. Some prophesy unemployment, others the disorganization of market forces.... What is your opinion on this as a people's deputy? And how do you rate the possibility of supplying the market with goods by means of conversion?

[Gidaspov] I think that the country's emergence from the economic crisis in which we have found ourselves will indeed require effort and a considerable amount of time. That is because there must be a radical economic reform, including the second stage of the reform of the political system. That is essential. But the changes must not have an adverse effect on people's well-being or depress an already low standard of living. We, as deputies, must elaborate and adopt a package of laws which will enable all our reforms to be implemented on a legal basis. This is hard work. On a number of complex draft laws—such as, for example, the Law on Ownership and the Law on the State Enterprisess—we may not be able to find a mutually acceptable solution right away (that is demonstrated by the present debates at the Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet). Then it will be necessary to make use of the so-called "framework model" of a law which will be adopted and approved as a draft subject to practical verification.

For example, what happened with the law on the taxation of enterprises? Incidentally, that law is directly linked with increasing prosperity. Actual calculations showed that a considerable group of major scientific research associations and industrial enterprises were on unequal terms compared with others.

As for problems connected with the conversion of the defense sectors, before dealing with that aspect of the matter, I would note that my personal view is that a great power such as the USSR must have a mighty army. And no conversion processes can be allowed to reduce our defense potential below the permissible level. By that I mean that conversion questions must be approached very carefully. But on the whole, at any event as far as Leningrad is concerned, defense enterprises and military people understand very well the need to convert production. We have defined the priority areas for them, namely, the production of consumer goods for the market, the production of high-efficiency agricultural equipment, the production of equipment for the food and light industries, the production of equipment needed for the solution of Leningrad's environmental problems and the production of equipment for health care. It should be noted that defense complex enterprises in the oblast are already producing eight types of agricultural equipment right now. This is good equipment, it works consistently and reliably. Consumer goods production has also increased. But unfortunately demand considerably outstrips supply...

[Streltsov] Leningrad is a multinational city. What steps are the city's leadership and the CPSU Obkom taking to prevent the kind of tension now being felt in, for example, the Baltic, Moldavia, and other parts of the country? The activity of informal organizations similar to the "Democratic Union" helped to inflame passions to some considerable degree in those places. And there are organizations like that in Leningrad, too...

[Gidaspov] Yes, you are right. There are around 100 nationalities living in Leningrad City and Oblast. And we see this as a blessing, not a problem or some kind of "nuisance," as it is portrayed in some other parts of the country. Because of Leningrad's history and the endurance of incredible trials, the people living here remain close to one another, both spiritually and in the purely worldly sense. And we do not expect any overt displays of national egoism; instead we see something else: They are being held in check. A well educated man, a Leningrader understands that discord merely aggravates the problems of our life. On the whole it seems to me that some of the leaders of the informal organizations, including the Democratic Union, often insult common sense with their simplistic interpretation of the history and role of the CPSU in society's life. It is here that we communists must remain equal to the task by relying on common sense above all. But what concrete steps should we take? For example, the obkom and oblast executive committee [obkom] are currently tackling the question of increasing the number of printed publications in the languages of the ethnic groups living in our oblast, groups such as the Karelians. Together with representatives of the intelligentsia, we are considering ways to increase the number of ethnic schools. There is no restraint here—only help. The best way to deprive the "denouncers" of the very subject matter of their oratorial exercises is by action. Those who get things done are always held in high regard.

[Streltsov] Young people's problems are very acute today. They are directly linked to the new intake that is entering the Army and the Navy, with which Leningrad is indissolubly linked, by the way. You are not only the oblast's party leader and a USSR people's deputy, but also a member of the Leningrad Military District Military Council. This is yet another dimension of your work...

[Gidaspov] We were bound to touch on young people's problems in our conversations. They cannot fail to be of concern to all of us today. The most distressing problem is the increase in youth crime. In addition, processes connected with toxic substance abuse, drug addiction, and alcoholism are developing all the time. It is hard to discuss these matters calmly. You are right, this is a matter of the moral health of our Army, which we cannot ignore. From what angle should we tackle these problems? From every one, I believe. A number of resolute measures are needed across the entire educational process: in the family, the kindergarten, the school, other educational institutions, and the Army. With the Leningrad intelligentsia's help we have already agreed to undertake radical measures in this respect and will use Leningrad's entire intellectual, cultural, and, if you will, spiritual potential to educate young people. I know well that the Army is sparing neither time nor effort on educational work with young people. In this work much is changing in favor of democracy and interest in the youngsters' future. I know that a breakthrough has been achieved in the oblast in the struggle against bullying. It is on the decline.

As for my direct work in units and subunits, I cannot claim to have achieved very much yet. Nevertheless, together with the command and political directorate of the Leningrad Military District we are observing life in military units, in formations, and on ships very closely. Quite recently we held a major conference at the District headquarters on that very subject and analyzed many questions, and we now have a fairly extensive and realistic program for joint work.

[Streltsov] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers are interested in how the problems resulting from the reduction of the Armed Forces are being interpreted in the activity of the city and oblast party and soviet leadership. Judging by the editorial mailbag, by no means all of the officers transferred to the reserve have come to a mutual understanding with the local authorities. First and foremost, of course, on the housing question, which the District Command cannot resolve on its own.

[Gidaspov] I very well understand KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's concern. Unfortunately, Leningrad cannot claim that the question of organizing housing for officers transferred out of the Armed Forces under the troop reduction is being resolved quickly or efficiently here. But as for finding work for reserve officers who have accommodation in Leningrad, I can say that engineering and technical specialists find work here quickly. They are welcomed with pleasure at industrial enterprises. It is harder for cadre commanders and political workers. We would be poor Leningraders if we failed to take care of our own people. But housing...I do not want to mislead people. The housing shortage is great. The party organization and the Gorkom and Obkom are making efforts to ensure the implementation of the "Housing-2000" program which was elaborated earlier. The implementation of this program will make it possible to resolve questions of housing provision for the military servicemen who have come to Leningrad too. However, this will not happen overnight. Nevertheless, we are seeking solutions here, including once more by working in close contact with the District Command. There are real difficulties in every aspect of our life but, no matter how bad things seem, they can be put right, especially since Leningraders do not lack vigor when it comes to changing things for the better.

[Streltsov] Here is a personal question for you, Boris Veniaminovich. You are still a scientist and a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Do you not regret leaving your old work? Science is now even more prestigious than party work...

[Gidaspov] I have already answered questions like that a number of times. And I always say that I had no choice, in the sense that I understand the situation in the party perfectly well and believe that today we need the efforts of everyone who cares for the fate of perestroyka and thus the country. Do not take those as merely high-flown words....

[Streltsov] Yes, this is now the time when society's best forces must shoulder a far greater burden than ever before. Thank you for this conversation....

PRAVDA Explores CPSU's Vanguard Role

PM0712194589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[PRAVDA editorial: "On the CPSU's Vanguard Role"]

[Text] The rapid pace of our current political life is throwing into greater and greater relief the revolutionary character of perestroyka. It is precisely during such times, jam-packed and overflowing with events, that the masses, to use Lenin's words, pass through an irreplaceable school of political education in a matter of weeks and months and learn lessons of political struggle which cannot be assimilated in years of tranquil development. This is borne out by the rapid growth of social activeness which we are witnessing in the country and the broad scope and keenness of political debate. At the focus of the current debates about perestroyka and its present and future is the question of the party. What should it be like at the present stage of society's transformation? What role should it be playing in societal life and in mutual relations with the state and other political institutions? On what principles should it be built? All these questions are being actively discussed both at party meetings and in the press and they are being raised at rallies.

What does it mean today to be marching in the vanguard of perestroyka? What demands are people making on the party and on the work of all its components? Do all party organizations in practice live up to these expectations and hopes, are all Communists entirely worthy of the lofty title and mission of a party member? After all, it is no secret that the vanguard role of the party in society and its prestige among the people are currently undergoing a serious test. Therefore every Communist and every party organization must clearly define its political stance and spare no effort to promote perestroyka and the renewal of the party which is advancing toward its 28th Congress.

One cannot make do here with old impedimenta and old notions. People who are hoping to retain their former positions merely by slightly refashioning orthodox structures or hastily putting a new face on obsolete forms and methods of work are misguided. It is impermissible to stagger in the wake of events and to succumb to inertia which fosters conservatism in thinking and actions. In order to respond to the call of the times, to really be in the vanguard of revolutionary transformations, to lead the masses from the front, the CPSU must radically restructure itself and become a truly renewed party.

Unquestionably, both the successes and failures of the renewal of society will be decided by the quality of our party. It is a historical feature of our country that the most important trends in social development have always been refracted through the party and its activities. It has been and remains the nerve center of both the political life and the economic sphere which is closely bound up with it. This also explains the swing of public consciousness toward a sharply critical attitude toward the work of party organizations viewed against the current, not very favorable, socioeconomic backdrop. The exactingness of the people toward the party and the effectiveness of its decisions and practical steps has risen sharply, and exigence has increased for what has been promised in past years and not fulfilled. The intensification of extremist tendencies both on the "right" and the "left" and the cacophony of frequently entirely subjective opinions on the prospects of the further development of the country also pour fat onto the fire of criticism. The most diverse alternatives and programs are put forward, from returning to the stagnant forms of the administrative-command system to the total renunciation of socialist principles. Populist demands have also gained currency, demands which boil down to the ideology of the "great leap forward" and are based on the psychology of universal leveling. And all this is served up by many fellow-travellers of perestroyka as serving its "defense", sometimes even "defense" against those who prepared it, initiated it, and have been purposefully implementing it during all the years of the country's post-April development.

It is not easy for people to find their bearings in this medley of extremely contradictory programs and stances. And it is even more difficult to elaborate the correct political line which would protect perestroyka against the vacillations and wrong actions of the "ultra-perestroyka champions" and guide it into the channel of stable and accelerated development. Only the party, fully discharging the functions of a political, intellectual, and moral vanguard of society, can act as the guarantor of such a development. And that means that all party organizations and all Communists must be equal to the current demands that are made on them.

The Communists' vanguard role does not fall to them automatically, once and for all, it is expressed above all in their practical deeds, and it needs daily reaffirmation by concrete actions. PRAVDA's editorial mailbag bears out the fact that increased militancy of party organizations and Communists' enhanced initiative, businesslike approach, and standard of organization rank today among their main tasks.

"I believe that it will be possible to lead the country out of the crisis, resolve the food, housing, and other acute problems, and improve interethnic relations, the sooner we, the Communists, grasp how very necessary practical actions and undertakings are today," P. Netsvetayev, engineer at the "Plesetskles" association and CPSU member since 1961, writes to the editorial office. "We must glean all that is valuable from the experience that has already been accumulated by party committees. I have read and heard that good experience has been accumulated in Vitebsk, Orel, Astrakhan, and other oblast party organizations. In our, Arkhangelsk party organization considerable efforts are also being made to improve the situation, but so far perestroyka is proceeding with difficulty, without the necessary consistency and persistence. Many party officials, let alone we, the "rank-and-file" members, have still not assumed an active stance. What are we waiting for?"

It is true that the perestroyka processes are developing very unevenly not just in various fields but also in various regions. Whence this "patchiness?" It cannot be ignored that the explanation here lies largely in the position taken up by party committees and party organizations, in the degree of their readiness to embark on cardinal changes, and in the political activeness of the party members themselves. Perestroyka is advancing relatively successfully wherever people renounce command and pressure tactics in real practice rather than just at the level slogan-type assurances, and master the system of applying truly skillful influence to perestroyka processes via Communists employed in specific sectors and labor collectives. Those, on the other hand, who even today under all kind of pretexts continue to cling to the rusty levers of edict methods are deliberately dooming their efforts, sometimes very energetic efforts, to failure.

In resorting to new, unorthodox approaches to tackle "old" and new problems, party committees are called upon to set the tone in overcoming the lack of organization, irresponsibility, and indifference toward the requirements and needs of the working people which are hampering the cause. This is being stated more and more loudly today by both Communists and nonparty people. The more persistently and fruitfully the struggle against mismanagement, sloppiness, group egoism, and free-loading is waged, the better and faster will we advance. In this context it is impossible not to share the puzzlement of V. Bashelin, a fitter at a Moscow oblast plant and CPSU member since 1957, expressed in a letter to PRAVDA: "For some reason the elementary truth that no one will resolve our worsening problems for us is somehow forgotten in the rally-like chaos. Many of us are meanwhile working half-heartedly, producing substandard goods, some are guilty of absenteeism and drunkenness, but, you see, they claim to be "disillusioned" because perestroyka is failing to produce results."

Let us not forget that the complexion of the party member and of the party as a whole is often judged by people in terms of just such negative manifestations, in terms of specific Communists' attitudes toward the job in hand. What are they going to think about the proclaimed slogans or major measures if they encounter the "individual" bureaucrat who turns a deaf ear to the population's needs and requirements and if they encounter passivity and indifference on the part of party comrades? That is why party organizations must persistently and consistently establish in collectives the spirit of creativity and and of organic rejection of formalism and inertia, and bring to book those who display communist arrogance and haughtiness. Such "cadres" cannot be given responsible posts. A more resolute effort must be made to promote the really enterprising personnel who treat people with sensitivity.

People place very high demands on members of elected party organs, who are supposed to be real leaders of Communists and to actively implement the party's policy and its line of the democratization and humanization of society. This is indicated, in particular, by reactions to the recent "Member of the Central Committee" series in PRAVDA. Those elected to leading organs are expected not just to represent, but be actively involved in elaborating measures to accelerate economic and political reforms and solve vital problems of society's social and spiritual development. Members of the Central Committee, F. Voronin, party veteran from Stavropol Kray, writes, "must vigorously express the opinions of the Communists who elected them and provide a secure link between the Central Committee and the masses."

Of course, these demands apply not only to the aktiv and the leaders. The moral right to lead the party in society must be confirmed by the conduct, life stance, and lofty moral qualities of all Communists. Every party member must set an example of upholding the people's interests and implementing socialist ideals and effectively contribute to public dialogue and the consolidation of all progressive forces on the basis of the principles of perestroyka. The party will continue to painstakingly clear away the obstructions of the past, uncompromisingly severing the gangrenous legacy of Stalinism and of the period of stagnation and laying low the bastions of the bureaucratic administration system and ossified mental stereotypes. This difficult work demands a great deal of courage, will, and persistence today. Unfortunately, some party members appear recently to have dropped their hands when faced with the plethora of problems, and a mood of uncertainty and pessimism has taken over. Now that party organizations are entering a very complex political campaign, connected with the elections to republican and local organs of power, such "defeatist" attitudes are intolerable. It is action, struggle, including ideological and political, and active work among the people that test a Communist's true qualities. It is the only way Communists gain the right to be the moral and political vanguard of the people.

The authority of the party and its vanguard role are determined by an ability to see further and deeper than other social and political forces, to analyze complicated social processes, and work out accurate forecasts for the future. The future belongs to the party that possesses a mighty intellectual potential and relies on a genuinely scientific analysis of reality.

The CPSU platform of practical action that is currently being elaborated should be based on the sound philosophical foundation of creative Marxism-Leninism, on the experience and lessons of perestroyka. When beginning the historic cause of transforming the country in April 1985, the party was unable, of course, to obtain some kind of ready-made all-embracing action plan "broken up into stages" and predetermined results. The strategy and concept of perestroyka was the product of live interaction between theory and practice, they have been amplified and enriched by the masses' creativity, and have been nourished by the input of social science. This work must continue. M.S. Gorbachev's article "The Socialist Idea And Revolutionary Perestroyka" which was published in PRAVDA gave new momentum to progress in this sphere.

One of the sensitive issues in today's discussions is the party's place in the political system and its reciprocal relations with the soviets and social organizations and movements. This is a complex of questions of fundamental significance which undoubtedly deserves broad public attention and all-around discussion. But often the whole matter is reduced to demands to revoke Article 6 of the USSR Constitution on the CPSU as the leading and directing force of Soviet society. What is our position on this score?

It must be said with the utmost clarity that one shouldn't cling to the letter of specific formulas. Much of what was built up or laid down during the years of the personality cult and the period of stagnation is now being consigned to the past. The party's functions are changing, it is ceasing to be a component of the administrative-edict system which in the past was also reflected in the country's Basic Law. Clearly, during perestroyka it is necessary to work thoroughly to improve our Constitution, too, in the light of perestroyka's lessons and accumulated experience. In this process any constitutional provision, like Article 6, may be subject to revision, modernization, or even deletion. This must be done within the framework of the process of the radical constructive reworking of the entire text of the Basic Law. That work has already begun. In this connection the question is: Will the "hasty" revision of one article be justified? Without fuelling emotions and issuing irresponsible appeals it is necessary to carefully examine these questions and consider whether such a campaign for the rapid deletion of Article 6 will benefit the cause of perestroyka or harm it.

Clearly, the acceleration of perestroyka will not be helped by the proposal to "subordinate" the party to the soviets that is sometimes voiced. In fact, this is nothing but a reproduction of the old pattern of mutual relations between party and state organs except merely that it is "upside down," as it were. The authors of such proposals are dominated by the stereotypes of the administrative-edict hierarchical system. Yet the point is to break that outmoded model and to make the party truly a political and ideological force acting within the framework of the Constitution.

Nor can one overlook the obvious: Such talk is being used as a screen to hide attempts to denigrate and sometimes even devalue the party's authority and force it out of the arena of active political life. There must be utter clarity here: These are attempts using unsavory means backed by frustrated political ambitions and a fundamental irresponsibility. Perestroyka needs the party. A renewed, active, and strong party which together with renewed soviets and in alliance with all progressive movements should unite the people and consolidate society to carry out the urgent changes.

There is less than a year until the 28th CPSU Congress. In formulating a political action platform and creating new Statutes, the party is seeking paths of renewal, the democratizaton of the norms of its organizations' life, and the solution of the tasks facing the country. PRAVDA is called on to play a constructive and weighty role in this. The newspaper is striving to keep pace with the processes of revolutionary changes, to generalize and consider the practical experience of party committees and primary organizations, and to help renewal by concrete efforts. Of course, we still have quite a lot to do to reach the level of the demands that Lenin placed on the newspaper, to become in fact the collective organizer of the party's ranks, and to promote their unity on the basis of the principles of renewal. At the same time party committees must also help their newspaper—by word, deed, and the competent choice of themes and locations of valuable experience, constructive proposals and critical remarks. We must promote the single common party cause of perestroyka together.

The future of the motherland and the fate of socialism depend on each of us today. Communists must be in the forefront in all areas of revolutionary restructuring. And the latter itself is fashioning the new complexion of the Communist of our time, the new complexion of Lenin's party.

More on 7 Dec Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Session

1315 GMT

LD0812182189

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1315 GMT on 7 December resumes its live relay of the 4th day of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius, with Lionginas Sepetys chairing the session. The Vilnius Domestic Service announcer states that there is a group of radio and television correspondents from the Netherlands present at the session.

There are 255 deputies present at the session.

At the start of the session, Lionginas Sepetys informs the House that a letter from the Election Commission has been received by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet presidium, in which concern is expressed about the incongruity of Article 2 of the Law on Elections and the troops's right to vote. Incidentally it states: "The commission is not sure if this decision of the Supreme Soviet applies to all servicemen stationed on the territory of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, or present in the republic on the day of elections, in brackets—which runs counter to Article 2 of the Law on Elections—or does it only apply to soldiers who have the right to citizenship of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic? Such contradictions make the work of the Commission difficult, especially keeping to the deadlines foreseen by the law on elections."

Following this the above Commission appealed to the Supreme Soviet to provide a clear interpretation of the 29 September, 1989, Decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium was entrusted with the task of complying with this request.

Deputy Knasys, minister of agriculture, reads out a new edition of a letter to Nikolay Ryzhkov. The letter is about new purchasing prices which had to be introduced from 1 January, 1990. However, the letter reads, this question had not been resolved and this caused grave concern among the staff of the agro-industrial complex. It says: "We would like to inform you that purchasing prices on this produce will be decided by this republic independently, in compliance with the adopted decision on the Economic Independence of the Baltic Republics. These prices will be introduced from 1 January 1990. Further, in accordance with new purchasing prices new proposed prices for agriculture products supplied to the All-Union funds will be proposed."

A vote was taken on this decision and with a majority of 240, the text of the letter was confirmed.

Deputy (Snieckus) proposes to set up a group of deputies working in agriculture which would help to solve problems of agriculture more efficiently.

The next item on the agenda is confirmation of decrees adopted by the Supreme Soviet Presidium between the sessions. The report is given by Liudvikas Sabutis, secretary of the Presidium. His report mainly concentrates on the current work carried out in complience with the laws adopted by the session.

L. Sabutis says that the current publication "Tarybu Darbas," a booklet published by the Presidium which carries documents of the Supreme Soviet, will now be enlarged and given a different name—"News of The State." This is going to be a weekly organ of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers.

Following this, Sabutis gives a brief account of all the legislation work being currently carried out.

Then the last item on the agenda is discussed, concerning answers to deputies' enquiries. Comrade Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet takes the floor.

V. Astrauskas begins his speech with a detailed account of the workload that the Presidium has to carry out every day. This is done in response to the severe criticism from several deputies about the work and performance of the Presidium, which was voiced at the first part of the session. He admitted that although there were shortcomings in the work of the Presidium, these were not deliberate. Deputy Zigmas Vaisvila once again voices his concern about the performance of the Presidium, despite the explanations given by Vytautas Astrauskas. Vaisvila says that he admitted that the Presidium cannot carry out the work properly if it wants to meet the deadlines.

Following this, Deputy Imbrasas answers the questions from Deputy Romualdas Ozolas, who alleged that archive materials are being destroyed at various offices and ministries including the KGB.

Deputy Imbrasas gives an account of the work carried out by the commission to investigate these allegations. He reads the conclusions, which indicate where the majority of archives of the republic were kept and who was responsible for their safety. He says that as there was no law passed in this republic which would define and regulate the work of the archives, these were obliged to comply with the laws and regulations of the USSR in their work. This did not complly with the interests of the public of this republic and, therefore, the situation should be changed, says the speaker. Laws on archives should be passed as soon as possible and archives should be made subbordinate to the republic and not to the center. Further, he speaks about specific difficulties encountered by the archives, such as work, pay etc. He states that the commission did not find any evidence of archives being destroyed or taken out of the republic. He says that the dcestruction of documents at the KGB archives was carried out according to the regulations indicated in the instructions. The commission did not find any violations of these regulations.

Sepetys then says said that concern was voiced over allegations that valuable equipment was being taken out of the territory of the republic, while removing it from enterprises of this republic.

A representative from the Council of Ministers replies on this issue, saying that enterprises of all-union subbordination, such as Ignalina AES, the Mazeikiai Oil Refinery, Azotas production amalgamation and others, sold the unwanted equipment. He says that no evidence was found that the above standing organs issued orders to remove equipment against the will of the management of the enterprise.

Other enquiries from deputies are of local significance, about the problems of financing local transport, draining land in this republic, and hunting grounds for the priveleged party and administration elite.

The session is then adjourned for 20 minutes.

The session resumes. The first question for discussion is an inquiry from a group of deputies concerning the future and present operation of the Klaipeda Pulp and Paper Combine. Kazimieras Miniotas, minister of the timber industry, is asked to answer the enquiry. The speaker outlines future plans for the reconstruction of the combine and reducing the level of pollution which is now causing concern to the people of Lithuania. Miniotas describes the reasons which he says can prove that the paper pulp production line should not be closed down, as demanded by the deputies.

The next question is placed by a group of deputies and concerns military service for Lithuanian citizens. Deputy Ignotas, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, takes the floor to answer this question. He mentions the decision adopted by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet about military service for the citizens of the Lithuanian SSR: "It has been proposed to the USSR Supreme Soviet to entrust he USSR Ministry of Defense to allow the possibility of young Lithuanian men doing their military service on the territory of this republic, or if this is not possible, to do their military service in the Baltic military area starting in 1990. "The decisions also demands that in future Lithuanian military divisions are re-established, that Lithuanian are not sent to military construction divisions which are not subordinated to the Ministry, and that in future all military divisions of this type are abolished. Then he recalled all the events which followed and which had been monitored and reported, such as the meeting of Sakalauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, and USSR Defense Minister Yazov on 30 October this year. He says: "Bearing in mind that issues related to defense are within the competence of the union organs, in solving problems related to military service by our young men we believe that we should proceed by a different route. We must use the right of the initiative of the law granted to the deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet or the People's Congress, to prepare and present a relevant bill on this issue. This has already been done by our neighbors, the Latvians. We believe that we would achieve more if we proceeded along these lines." Concluding he says that the Republican Council of Ministers will continue to defend the rights of the young men of this republic within the framework of its competence.

Kazimieras Montieka says that among other negative facts concerning the army, is that young men return from military service in the Soviet Armed Forces having been turned into alcoholics, because alcohol abuse in the army is widely spread. Another deputy voices his concern about the risk of AIDS infection in the army. To substantiate this he reads parts of letters from soldiers in which they claim that rape by older soldiers is common in the army. Following this, V. Baltrunas give information about where of the complaints and queries sent to the Presidium has been transferred to be dealt with.

The last issue on the agenda is a discussion of matters related to Leonas Riauba, minister of trade; a vote of no confidence is proposed, among allegations about corruption, incompetence protectionism and so forth. L. Riauba is given the floor. He begins "iluminating" the situation in the republican market. "Everything" he says is about difficulties and goods in short supply. and at the same time the points to the reasons why some goods, like washing powder, are in short supply. He says that the best specialists in the food industry left the industry and joined cooperatives, where they earned much more. Other problems such as transport are also mentioned. He protests that all attacks launched on him by the press and the republican radio about his personal life style, acquisition of furniture, moving into a larger flat etc are biased and unfair. The minister answers questions about allegations concerning his car purchased for hard currency. He says that this is not true. Following this, E. Bickauskas demands that the house listens to a radio report by Vilnius radio journalist Benas Rupeika. The report contains material about the republican minister of trade and was broadcast on 4 December. In this report Benas Rupeka says that a vote of no confidence in the present minister, at the Supreme Soviet, could be supported by many telephone calls from radio listeners that he had had already. The report also contains facts of various favors granted by the minister to his friends and relatives.

Following this, Deputy Egidijus Bickauskas, asks if the minister is going to resign, after he has heard all these compromising facts about him. The minister attempts to justify all these allegations and accusations. Heated discussions concerning the minister of trade and the possibility of his remaining in his post now take place. Vytautas Sakalauskas, chairman of the Council of Ministers, is asked to voice his opinion on the matter. He proposes to set up a commission of deputies to investigate the matter. A vote of no confidence in the minister of trade is put: only 56 deputies vote in favor. Deputies say that it would be unfair to dismiss a person from his post on allegatioons alone: These have not yet been proved. A commission is set up to investigate the allegations against L. Riauba.

The session concludes with several deputies speaking on various pressing topics, such as the future law on the press, law and order, and pollution.

The live relay ends at 1730 GMT.

Lithuanian Constitutional Amendment Dispute Viewed

PM1112134589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Matulyavichyus dispatch: "Session Proceedings"]

[Text] Vilnius, 8 Dec—Several times during its current session, which has lasted 6 days in all, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet tried to tackle Article 6 of the republic Constitution, but every time the adoption of a final decision was postponed for different reasons.

The polemic that took place did not reveal any special differences as regards the need itself to amend this article of the Constitution, which defines the leading role of the Communist Party in society. The dispute centered mainly on the timing of the introduction of the amendments.

The session approved a proposal on a new edition of this article. It now states that parties, social organizations, and social movements are established in accordance with the procedure laid down by law and operate within the framework of the Constitution and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] laws. Corresponding amendments have also been introduced in Article 7 of the republic Constitution.

The session approved the fundamentals of the republic's socioeconomic development and budget for 1990 and examined some other qeustions. A republic electoral commission for elections of Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies was set up, and the procedure determined for the entry into force of the Law on Elections of Local Soviet Deputies, which are scheduled for 24 March 1990.

Amended Articles 6,7 Reported

PM0812174989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Dec 89 Morning Edition p2

[ELTA-TASS report under the rubric "Sessions of the Union Republics' Supreme Soviets": "The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] Vilnius, 7 Dec—The session of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet completed its work here today.

After a stormy debate, the fundamentals of the republic's economic and social development in 1990 were adopted, as well as the Lithuanian budget for next year and the normatives governing local budgetary revenue in the republic's regions and cities. They have been established on the basis of the provisions contained in the Law on Lithuanian Economic Autonomy. The structure of the national economy has been changed and the number of targets regulating economic and social development has been reduced. The state order for industrial output is going to be put together in a totally new way. With the exception of foodstuffs, some groups of consumer goods, and construction materials in short supply, the state order is to be established only for those products to be supplied to other republics.

A large proportion of the republic's national income is going to be channelled into the social sphere next year. Growth of fixed production assets is to be suspended. Industrial output will increase by 4 percent.

Debate arose during the discussion of the draft Law on Lithuanian Trade Union Rights. In the opinion of deputies, it needs to be fundamentally reworked. The Supreme Soviet resolved to submit this draft law for public discussion.

More than 30 deputies expressed their opinions during discussion of the question of changing Article 6 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, in which the CPSU is defined as the leading, guiding party in society. The session adopted the Law on Changing Articles 6 and 7 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution. They are now set out as follows: "Article 6. Parties, social organizations, and social movements are set up according to the procedure stipulated by legislation and they function within the framework of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution and laws. Article 7. Political, professional, youth, women's, veterans', cooperative, and social organizations and social movements, creative unions, and scientific societies participate in the administration of state and social affairs and in the solution of political, economic, and sociocultural matters in accordance with their statutory and program tasks." A Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet resolution on political parties was also adopted. It states, in particular: "The present Communist Party of Lithuania is deemed the legal successor of the Communist Party of Lithuania registered on 25 June 1940 in the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Lithuanian republic."

The Lithuanian SSR Law on Elections of Deputies of Local Soviets of People's Deputies in the Lithuanian SSR and a number of other documents were adopted.

Party Chief Brazauskas on Upcoming Congress

LD0812232889

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 8 December carries a recorded interview with Algirdas-Mikolas Brazauskas, Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee first secretary, by Benas Rupeika, Vilnius radio journalist. At the beginning of the interview, Brazauskas that says he is not inclined to comment on the Supreme Soviet session which had just concluded; he says that the "house of the party has its own worries. The Congress is coming irreversibly, and therefore, all the energy must be devoted to organizing a good Congress."

Asked to comment on press and media reaction to the amendment of Article 6 of the Constitution, Brazauskas says that "the action has taken place and the article has been amended. Of course, as on many occasions before, we are the first yet again." He says that this fact aggravated the situation. Brazauskas says that not only in the Soviet Union, but in other countries as well, the Communist Party would have to learn to work with other political parties. He says: "This is what we are doing at the moment. There are many things I cannot foresee, what our future relations will be; however, some people interpret the amendment of Article 6 in a very simplified way. Today we are not only a legally existing party; we are also the ruling party. However, we will see what will happen."

Brazauskas then discusses the upcoming party congress and the documents concerning the action program and the statute, which were made public some time ago. "Evidently these documents are in their first edition, and after debates at the congress these will be shaped into what will later be adopted. I believe they will be adopted. I have some reservations about the future of the party program. I am convinced that if the congress adopted the shorter version of the program on short term actions, then the main program, which embraces long-term objectives and is wider and deeper in its theoretical basis, could be adopted. I have heard remarks and opinions that it was hardly possible to adopt such a radical program at the congress all at once."

Rupeika then raises another issue, saying that currently "people from the political past" were at the top of this administration. Brazauskas disagrees, saying that these people had good experience in their work.

Rupeika then asks Brazauskas about their political awareness.

Brazauskas responds: "You see, perhaps we will never be able to line people up and draw a line for them with a ruler. Every man has his own concepts. Some people do not think like that. But then, believing that everybody has to think the same way, where is democracy? We are advocates of democracy. Why not? If somebody has his own convictions and these have been argued, we must listen to them. We said time and again that we have to get rid of this syndrome of 'if you do not support me then you are against me.'" Brazauskas says that matters related to the economy should not be become a matter of politics.

Rupeika then draws Brazauskas' attention to the fact that the moral values of those in the administration are also of great importance, especially in times of great economic crisis. Brazauskas agrees, saying that all violations of moral conduct are more conspicuous in present day conditions. Having said that, Brazauskas disagrees that many high-ranking officials in the present government have lost their reputation.

Brazauskas says that he wants to be present at the beginning of the Second Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow, and to listen to Ryzhkov's report on the entire economy of the USSR and on improving the economic situation in the Soviet Union, although he is not sure if this will be on the agenda on the first day of the Congress.

Rupeika then mentions the recent plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, saying: "I think this was a small rehearsal for the congress; this was the campaign that revealed who was who."

Brazauskas replies that this was not a campaign to gain points for the party before the elections, like some attempted to claim. He continues: "This plenum—and it was the 22nd plenum—was rather badly organized because we thought we would hold it somewhat later; however, when we learned that this delegation headed by V. Medvedev was coming and that Comrade Medvedev was bringing an appeal to the Lithuanian Communists by M. Gorbachev, then of course we had to hold the plenum. The appeal was published in the press. I imagine that this appeal is a document, although not everybody received it in the same way, because it is a rather unusual event in the party life.

"I had to answer the questions asked at the Politburo session and which are still being asked. And I tried to answer them. I think I did the job, because there were many speakers who confirmed these statements and the argumentation (?laid out in my report)."

Rupeika then asks: "Both the amendment to Article 6 and the extraordinary party congress, all this is political activity, and this is once again unprecedented. we can hardly compete with states in Eastern Europe in these activities; they live and function in different conditions. And even there, boundaries of political possibilities exist. Do you not think that we have already reached this maximum of possibilities, and to carry on being always the first would mean further risks or perhaps be... I do not want to utter this word."

Brazauskas replies: "Yes, we have reached this boundary. We have reached it. We have to assess it. Some even say that we have already crossed it in one or another direction of our activity. Well, indeed, perhaps this is true. It will now depend on how our tactics and strategies are shaped at the congress." Brazauskas says that he believes the elected deputies are the politically most conscious communists, who will discuss this matter with full seriousness at the Congress.

Rupeika then asks: "In an hour you will be flying off to Moscow to the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. What position will you adopt there; because I believe questions will be asked about all the topics we have just discussed?"

Brazauskas replies: "I have no special wish to speak, and I am not preparing to speak, especially on these topics. However, I am getting ready for any possible event. Well, the appeal by M. Gorbachev, our plenum, and the amendment to Article 6—all this is news."

Brazauskas says that people in Lithuania take all these changes rather like the normal course of events; however, in other parts of the country, where the level of restructuring has not reached the same level, people take it as something complex and most important. He says that it was his fate to be first secretary in this period. He concludes: "It is an interesting situation, I must admit. Concerning all these purely political matters, I would say this work is most dangerous now. It is not only the most important, it is even the most dangerous."

Authors of 'Threat' Mail Sought in Lithuania

90UN0312A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 46, 18-24 Nov 89 p 7

[Unattributed article: "The Investigation Is Continuing"]

[Text] Letters and leaflets that provoke and incite the population to national discord and that are directed at workers of state and public organizations began to appear recently in some Lithuanian cities and rayons. Taking into account the fact that the people of the republic were disturbed by such actions, which are incompatible with the process of democratization, steps have been taken by the Office of the Public Prosecutor and the Committee for State Security of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] to expose their authors.

Some of them have already been ascertained. For example, Vidunas Stontselis, a resident of Vilnius. Law enforcement organs of the republic have restricted themselves in his case to measures of a warning and educational nature, taking into consideration the young age of V. Stontselis and also the fact that he was sincerely remorseful and apologized to the people he had offended.

But there is Stasis Zhichkus, a resident of Yurbarkas, against whom criminal proceedings were instituted. Using the name "League of Freedom of Lithuania" and the nonexistent "Army of Freedom of Lithuania" as a cover, he sent letters to various organizations in which he threatened their workers with physical reprisals (murder), for which the rayon people's court sentenced him to 1.5 years in prison with a 3-year probationary period.

The investigation of authors of other provocative messages is continuing.

Call for Dismissals at Riga Party Aktiv

LD1112103189 Riga in Latvian to Europe 2030 GMT 6 Dec 89

[Text] Around 1,000 representatives of the so-called Communist Party aktiv of Riga, namely secretaries of party organizations of enterprises and establishment and workers of the apparatuses of Communist Party rayon committees, gathered yesterday in the House of Political Education in Riga.

An appeal to the Communists of Latvia was discussed. We shall turn to this appeal again further in the broadcast.

The chief speaker was Arnolds Klaucens, secretary of the Riga city committee of the Communist Party of Latvia. He emphasized that the Bureau of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee insufficiently consistently takes a stand against those who appeal to the Communist Party of Latvia to leave the CPSU.

Arnolds Klaucens emphasized that some members of the bureau are personally responsible for the appearance of the appeal and for the threat to split the party.

Later speakers specifically demanded that Janis Vagris, Janis Oherins, and Ivars Kezbers be dismissed from the Bureau of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committees. These proposals were applauded by some in the hall.

Sharp criticism was also directed against the mass information media. Radio and television this time—and it is not for the first time—received the main share.

Arnolds Klaucens, Communist Party of Latvia secretary of the Riga city believes that the Bureau of the Central Committee is also responsible for the radio and television slipping out of party control. According to him, radio and television have become the radio and television of the People's Front of Latvia.

Unfortunately it must be said that apart from appeals to dismiss various people, and apart from appeals to subject all mass information media to party control, no other constructive proposals were heard.

Latvian Soviet Elections Previewed

PM0912171989 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 1

[Own correspondent V. Proskura report under the rubric "What We Are Taking With Us To The Elections": "Where Does the Truth Lie?"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Riga—Elections to local soviets will be taking place in Latvia and Estonia on Sunday. Our own correspondent V. Proskura reports from Riga.

The figures read out at the pre-election press conference organized by the Riga city party committee (gorkom) are food for thought in themselves. This Sunday, some 600 candidates for deputy in 120 electoral okrugs will be standing for the "capital's parliament," as the Riga city soviet is known in the republic. More than 60 different sociopolitical organizations are taking part in the current election campaign.

As was stressed at the Riga Communist Party of Latvia Gorkom plenum dedicated to the local soviet elections, there has been a storm of activity by all social and national strata of the population and an intensive ideological struggle is being waged. Some informal associations are making no bones about their aim: Namely, to "measure swords" with the capital's party organization.

A letter from A. Rubiks, chairman of the Riga city soviet executive committee (gorispolkom), published in the party press, and the resolution passed on this political statement by the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee Bureau have caused a real stir among the public. "The leaders of the Latvian People's Front have recently issued regular statements on the need to win the forthcoming elections..., thereby gain political power..., and eliminate the leading role of the CPSU," the letter said. "One wonders: From whom do the gentlemen (this is the form of address used between members of the Latvian People's Front)...intend to wrest power? From the Communist Party of Latvia? From the soviets? And in the name of what will this be done? The answers to these questions are clearly given in the program and statute adopted by the Latvian People's Front Congress. These documents no longer speak of restructuring on the basis of the CPSU principles and platform, omit any reference to the soviets as bodies of the existing state authority, and 'project' authority under the leadership of the Latvian People's Front onto the 'Movement for the National Independence of Latvia' and other formations which resemble political parties." The Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee Bureau, as indicated in the resolution, "largely shares the concern at the present political and social tension in the republic expressed in the letter."

A heated discussion on the issues raised in A. Rubiks' letter has developed everywhere: At meetings between candidates for deputy and the electorate, at workers' rallies, open party meetings, and party committee sittings. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA is publishing numerous responses from working people, communists, and non-party people and messages from factory and plant collectives and primary party organizations in support of the political stand taken by the author of the statement. But there are also other points of view. These are being ostentatiously publicized—indeed, quite aggressively publicized—by mass media associated with the Latvian People's Front. An enlarged Riga party gorkom plenum has even submitted a special resolution "On the Biased Attitude to the Activity and Sociopolitical Views of Comrade A.P. Rubiks, Member of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee and USSR People's Deputy."

The "Appeal to Latvian Communists" drafted and published by a group of "members of the opposition" and the secretaries of some party committees, mainly peripheral, has added fuel to the fire of the election battles. The authors of this appeal include M. Rukmane, first secretary of the Riga Kirovskiy rayon party committee (raykom). At first glance, it is just an "invitation" to an internal party discussion. But this act of propaganda has immmediately found itself at the center of current events.

This is what the "group of comrades" has to say: "Ossified theory remote from reality, claims to irrefutable truth, monopoly by the party apparatus of authority, administration, and ideology, disregard of objective economic laws, and suppression of political pluralism have led society...into crisis."

Strictly speaking, the authors of the appeal needed this kind of preamble in order to then attempt to justify their intention to form "a new type of party independent of the CPSU." The initiators of this debate, renowned for their ties with the Latvian People's Front, have "struck from the rear" at the republic party organization right on the eve of the elections.

However, many communists have strongly condemned this stance. I will quote an extract from an open letter from workshop and sector party bodies at the "REZ" Production Association (this is just one of hundreds of similar resolutions): "We believe that communists who have embarked on a path of political degeneration...and preach ideas of anti-Sovietism, nationalism, and anti-communism are not worthy of being members of our party.... For the sake of our future and the future of our descendants, we cannot allow a handful of political adventurists who have overstepped the mark to play with the destiny of the peoples of Soviet Latvia...."

"Prompt reaction by party bodies and ordinary party members to voters' needs, to the complex social situation, and to heated social situations, communists' attempts at frank, open dialogue with their political rivals, and a timely rebuttal of the ideological enemy and opportunists of various colors—these are evidently the most characteristic features of the present election campaign," A. Klautsen, first secretary of the Riga Communist Party of Latvia Gorkom, believes.

Now, as I write the final lines in this report, there are only a few hours to go until the elections. A meeting of the Latvian capital's party aktiv has been held in the Political Education Center. Representatives of the joint council of Latvian labor collectives and the International Front of Working People, as well as many workers, were among the audience. The renewed bloc of communists and non-party people, speakers said, urges the people of Riga to vote for active patriots of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and for those who are not afraid of difficulties and are prepared to fight to overcome them....

I should point out, incidentally, that 55 percent of the candidates for deputy standing for the Riga city soviet are CPSU members. Half of all the nominees are from the production sector: from workers to directors. Sunday will show whom the people of the republic's capital are going to follow.

Elections Begin 10 Dec

LD1012144189 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Riga December 10—By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina:

Elections to local government bodies began in Latvia today. A person to have lived in Latvia for no less than the last five years can be deputy of the city, district, settlement of village council, in accordance with the law, recently passed by the Latvian parliament. This requirement will enable the election of the people who know Latvia's traditions, history and culture, and who take a lively interest in its problems, it was said at the parliament's session.

A discussion between various political forces, mainly between the Communist Party and the Popular Front, began on the eve of the elections. Their candidates repectively stand at 36.6 and 32 per cent. Their platforms differ by the attitude to the future of the republic. The Communists want to see Latvia independent within a renewed Soviet federation, while the popular front seeks reinstatement of Latvia's state independence.

There are over 24,500 names on the ballot. One seat is contested on the average by two candidates, and the figure is about five in Riga, the capital of the republic.

Seventy five per cent of the candidates are Lettish. It is now clear that elections will have to be held anew in some Riga districts where there are 10-15 contestants per one seat. It is difficult to chose the most worthy from the numerous contestants.

Latvian Activist Arrested; Arms Cache Found

LD0612095789 Klaipeda MARITIME PRESS SERVICE in Russian 1000 GMT 3 Dec 89

[Text] [No date, as received] Riga—During an operation in the fight against organized crime, personnel of the Latvian Ministry of Internal Security and the Committee for State Security [KGB] detained 34-year old Leo Khirshsons, who claimed to be a photographer with the Focus Cooperative. A search revealed that he had a whole arsenal: 2 automatic pistols, a homemade grenade, a substantial number of cartridges, and about 20 items of cold steel.

During interrogation, Khirshsons stressed several times that he was a member of the Latvian Social Democratic Workers' Party [LSDWP]. A plan for a takeover of power in the republic was found on him, and lists of members of the coordinating center of the LSDWP's organizing bureau.

In the spring of this year, Khirshsons spent about 3 months in Sweden, where he met with Vilnis Zalkalns, deputy chairman of the LSDWP's Foreign Committee. Latvian listeners were told about this meeting by Radio Free Europe. In the summer of this year, Zalkalns, speaking at a political discussion in Sweden, replied thus to a question about ways of achieving independence for Latvia: We will do it ourselves and it will not come about without bloodshed.

Khirshsons stated in the interrogation that he needed weapons for self-defense. The KGB considers that in the course of the investigation it is necessary to clarify whether there is any connection between the words of the deputy chairman of the LSDWP Foreign Committee and the criminally punishable activity of the party activist who considers himself to be chairman of the organizing bureau's coordinating center. This would clearly also be not without interest to the delegates of the LSDWP Congress which is opening in Jurmala in December.

Estonian Election Campaign Termed 'Fierce'

LD0912000789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast, correspondent H. Lenk report—recorded]

[Text] Elections to the local soviets in Estonia are to take place on Sunday [10 December].

[Lenk] The preelection contest is fierce, and not just between those individuals standing but also between the various political movements, the interests of which are expressed by the individual candidates. The People's Front platform, for example, sees Estonia in the near future as a sovereign republic within the composition of the USSR. This platform helps voters make a choice between People's Front candidates and those of, say, the Party of National Independence, for whom the model for a future Estonia is merely a republic of the kind bourgeois Estonia was from 1920 to 1940. Of course, the platforms also have a lot to say about current issues as well: nature protection, providing one's hometown with services and utilities, etc.

Also to be considered a particular feature of the current elections is the fact that a group of voters and deputies who share the views of the Intermovement are preparing to boycott the elections and organize their own, using the production principle in the labor collectives to create alternative bodies of power. Calls for a boycott began after a group of Russian-speaking deputies left one of the sittings of the last session of the republic's Supreme Soviet to protest the adoption of a number of new laws. The overwhelming majority of Estonia's Communists condemn this step. The action by the Intermovement leaders, says a statement from the Kalininskiy Rayon party committee plenum, is a call to relinquish the preelection political contest. Intermovement wishes to disgrace the Russian-speaking and Estonian-speaking populations, adds labor veteran (Sergey Davydov), in a letter published in one of today's Tallinn papers.

You can see how the platforms and actions of Estonia's various political movements differ from one another. Incidentally, we have nearly 20 such movements in the republic at the moment. As a result, it will not be easy for the voters to make their choice the day after tomorrow. [video shows pages from newspapers in Russian and Estonian, including the headline: "How Should One Vote?" Also seen is a leaflet reading: "The basis of a law-governed state is the Constitution! Comrade! Do not take part in the anticonstitutional elections on 10 November! A boycott in the name of justice!" The leaflet is signed: "Estonian SSR Intermovement." The Russian-speaking deputies are shown leaving the Supreme Soviet session. Other deputies are shown attending the session. (Davydov's) letter is also shown.]

Intermovement Urges Boycott

LD1012140589 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1130 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Anders Eriksson report from Tallinn]

[Text] [Announcer] In Estonia, there are local elections today. But the Russian-speaking population of Estonia is being urged to boycott the elections as a protest against the new electoral laws that are being adopted in Estonia. It is still very uncertain whether the call will be heeded, reports Anders Eriksson.

[Eriksson] The so-called Intermovement, the organization that most strongly opposes the Estonian freedom struggle, has urged the Russian part of the population of Estonia to stay home from the elections for local and city soviets. The Inter-movement maintains that the new electoral laws, adopted for the first time, discriminate against Russians and drastically reduce their opportunities to participate in the political life of Estonia. The new law requires that a candidate in the elections must have lived in Estonia for at least 5 years, a criterion not met by a large proportion of the Russian population.

Earlier in the autumn the Intermovement held strikes at about 30 factories and extensive demonstrations, protesting both the electoral and the language laws. Faced with the local elections, they have now used placards and letters to urge Russian voters to boycott the elections.

But it is very uncertain how extensive the boycott will be in reality. In a call published in the newspapers here on Thursday [7 December] party functionaries at the Russian-dominated factories in Tallinn urged all voters to go and vote—and at these factories the power of the party is still great.

The Communist Party risks suffering a crushing defeat in the elections. The result for the Communist Party will be the most interesting, says one of the leading figures in the People's Front, Heinz Valk, who regards this as a dress rehearsal for the elections to the Estonian Supreme Soviet in March.

If a number of local party functionaries lose their seats in the local soviets, there is, of course, the risk that opinion within the party will turn against reform policies. In the election, 15 or so new groups have appeared which have never before taken part in political elections in the Soviet Union: the Christian Democrats, Social Democrats, and the Estonian Independence Party. Although this is an election of personalities, and thus it is difficult to draw direct political conclusions, the elections will still be an important barometer of where the people's political sympathies lie here, and how many of them, or rather how few of them, are still Communists.

Roundup of Estonian Local Elections

LD1112101289

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1800 GMT on 10 December carries a roundup of reports on the current elections to Estonian local soviets, in which voters face multiple choices: There are 8 people nominated for 2 seats in the Kalamaja area of Tallinn, 18 for 4 seats in another Tallinn constituency, and 19 for 5 seats at Polva. In Tallinn some voters may say they know next to nothing about some of the names, but with some there is enough prior knowledge to make a decision, according to the radio.

In Kohtla-Jarve, (Avold Pankin), director of the "Tarve" enterprise, is interviewed. He has just voted and is a candidate himself, with Nikolay Zakharov, first secretary of the Kohtla-Jarve party committee, standing at the same constituency. Reporter Aldur Paaro questions Pankin about the leaflets which have been distributed against him in Russian. The reporter asks if his case is unique, and Pankin says that there have been slanderous and offensive leaflets distributed about some other candidates, too. The reporter asks: "But would some kind of factions indeed go in for slanderous leaflets here in Kohtla-Jerve?" Pankin replies: "I believe that this is more a case of initiative of individual candidate deputies." He says that four organizations have merged in an electoral union in Kohtla-Jarve, and the union will continue work after these elections, with the March elections to come.

At a Tallinn polling station reporter Raul Malk questions the chairman of the election commission, who thinks that perhaps 70 percent of the people turned out. He says that a militia captain and a couple of People's Front men had been observing all day to ensure that things would go according to the rules.

Reporter Georg Pelisaar, in Polva, says that a member of the local election commission thinks that the turnout has been lower than during the previous elections in March, perhaps because the people are disappointed at the slow pace of changes.

Reporter Raul Malk interviews the deputy head of the soviet department at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, who says that at 1500 the turnout throughout the republic had been 61.55 percent, with variations in different localities. He does not have any more recent information. When Malk asks him about any complaints, the official says: "Yes, there were, of course, complaints. There were complaints first and foremost about the activity of the citizens' committees. In some places, right in front of the entrance to the voting hall, they were organizing registering of citizens. This, of course, was not acceptable to all our citizens, in Tallinn in particular." There were also complaints about lack of information on candidates, he added.

Discussions at Estonian Party Plenum Described

PM1112084789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[PRAVDA correspondent I. Teterin report: "Realism Versus Illusions"]

[Text] Tallinn, 7 Dec—The latest Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum discussed the political situation which has taken shape in the republic. Communists centered their attention on a broad spectrum of topical problems: the implementation of economic reform in conditions of republic economic accountability, the attitude to radical groups in society and the party itself, and the ways to build a democratic future for Estonia. The plenum rejected political slogans being put forward by certain public movements today, urging ordinary people to "build an independent republic." A report from V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, also described these tactics as "duping the people." A favorable future for Estonia can only be built on the basis of the realities of perestroyka and the stable international course of building a common European home.

The plenum urged Communists who do not agree with the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee's current course to refrain from leaving the party before the next congress. It has been decided to hold the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress in March 1990.

Estonia To Have Own Currency

LD0812142989 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1130 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Estonia is to have its own currency, the crown, by the end of next year. Consequently, within a few weeks an Estonian National Bank will be established to be responsible for the introduction of the new currency.

Despite the fact that the Supreme Soviet decision 2 weeks ago to give the Baltic republics far-reaching economic autonomy did not contain a green light for their own currencies, intensive planning work is now under way here in Estonia for the introduction of its new currency. Like the currency of the sovereign Estonia, it is to be called the crown, and, according to Estonian Deputy Premier Rein Otsason, it will be put into use as soon as in 1 year.

[Begin Otsason recording in Estonian fading into Swedish translation] It is dangerous to mention any exact dates, but I think that it will be a reality by the end of next year. An Estonian National Bank will be established within a few weeks, and the authority which deals with economic planning in Estonia has already been in contact with the printers of securities in Sweden, among others. A competition for the design of the new notes will be announced in due course.

In order to avoid the Estonian currency becoming as overvalued as the Soviet ruble, efforts will be made to create a balance between the total amount of money and the supply of goods, a balance now totally lacking in the Soviet Union. The amount of money for which there is no equivalent in goods is to be mopped up. A number of enterprises are to be formed into joint stock companies, and the shares will then be sold to the public. State-owned dwellings can also be sold. The prices of cars, for instance, can be raised, and moreover, state bonds can be sold. [end recording]

The introduction of an Estonian currency will thus mean that parts of the industry in Estonia will be privatized, and foreign investors are welcome. The purpose also is that the Estonian currency will be convertible with Western currencies.

Estonian Seaman Convicted of Smuggling

PM0712161589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR KGB"]

[Text] As a result of joint actions by the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] KGB and the republic customs office, Ilves, a seaman who goes on voyages abroad for the Estonian Maritime Shipping Company, was arrested while attempting to smuggle 101 aerosol cans of poisonous gas into the USSR for purposes of gain.

The investigation conducted by the Estonian SSR KGB established that the cans brought in by Ilves contained the strong "CS" toxin, which counts as a chemical weapon.

The criminal case involving to Ilves was tried in open session by the Estonian SSR Supreme Court 27 through 30 November. The degree of punishment for the criminal was determined as laid down in law.

Armenians To Revoke Article on Communist Power

AU1112143289 Paris AFP in English 1415 GMT 11 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec 11 (AFP)—Armenian nationalists intend to follow the lead of the Baltic republics and get the Communist Party's constitutional monopoly on power revoked, a leading nationalist said on Monday.

Babken Ararktsyan applauded last week's decision by the Lithuanian parliament to scrap the party's "anachronistic" monopoly and said his movement had already presented a similar bill to the Armenian parliament.

He said the bill had been thrown out "under strong pressure" from the apparatchik and the Communist Party first secretary. But a committee had been set up to examine the question and a new bill could go before parliament in the near future.

The bill which failed sought to abolish Article Six of the Constitution, which guarantees the Communist Party a leading role, and introduce a multiparty system in Armenia.

It also asserted Armenia's right to overrule federal laws if they are contrary to "democratic principles and the national interest of the Armenian people".

Parliaments in the Baltic republics of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia have already adopted a similar right to veto federal laws.

Mr. Araktsyan also condemned the "pernicious practice" of imposing some regional officials from Moscow. Second secretaries are traditionally appointed by Moscow.

He also spoke of the hardship resulting from the road and rail blockade imposed by neighbouring Azerbaijan over the disputed Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh. He said the enclave was getting all its supplies by air.

Armenia was short of petrol and many aircraft were grounded at Yerevan, the capital, because of lack of fuel.

Railroad Traffic for Stepanakert Resumes

LD0912151289 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] Baku December 9 AZERINFORM-TASS—Conflicting reports on the delivery of railway cargoes to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region appear of late. They are accompanied by rumours, give rise to unnecessary emotions and aggravate the already strained situation in the region.

"In accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution 'On Measures to Normalise the Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh' we take resolute actions to remove blockade from railways in Azerbaijan territory and to ensure a non-interrupted transportation of cargoes," said Shaik Rustamov, first deputy chief of the Azerbaijan Railway.

"The personnel of the railway did a good deal in recent days. Railway traffic in the direction of Stepanakert resumed on December 4. Cars with various cargoes, including food, petroleum products, and combined fodder, are now being unloaded at the railway station of the regional centre. Cars with other priority cargoes are on their way to Stepanakert.

"Trains for Nagorno-Karabakh are now formed without delay as cargoes arrive. This work is being done in accordance with schedule which we have worked out and which we keep under strict control," Rustamov said.

Azerbaijan Notes Tension Along Armenian Border

NC0912205189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 9 Dec 89

[Text] At the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs:

The resolute measures put into effect by the republic's party, soviet, and law enforcement organs to establish law and order in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] are causing rage and strong resistance in Armenian extremist circles, which do not hesitate to resort to even the most ignoble forms of trickery.

The fact that a blind eye was not turned to the reality of the fabrication of the NKAO problem has completely foiled their intentions of altering our republic's borders.

The establishment of the Azerbaijan SSR NKAO Organization Committee and the condemnation of the unconstitutional decision adopted by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet to unify the Armenian SSR and the NKAO have completely undermined the criminal intentions of the provacateurs, who recently intensified their disruptive activities. In this connection, the situation became significantly strained in rayons bordering Armenia, including Kubatly and Lachin Rayons, on 7 and 8 December. Exchanges of fire took place.

However, the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs announces that the rumors spread in Baku regarding significant losses and disorder and the forcible eviction of residents from a number of areas in Kubatly Rayon are completely baseless. In accordance with an agreement, residents of a number of villages in the rayon were temporarily transferred to guarantee their safety. The protection of residential areas was strengthened.

The situation stabilized yesterday and residents of these villages are returning to their homes. Special headquarters have been set up in Lachin and Goris to prevent lawless and illegal activities by the extremists. The representatives of the internal forces and groups of employees affiliated with the USSR, Azerbaijani, and Armenian Internal Affairs Ministries have been sent to these centers. It has been decided to attract the steadfast forces of society and elderly people to this work. The deputy internal affairs ministers of the two republics have been appointed as the leading officials at the headquarters.

The situation in the region is under control. Tension is gradually subsiding. The people are aware that the security and peace of all citizens and the immunity of our borders have been guaranteed by the internal forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the organs of the Azerbaijan SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Armenian Deputies Appeal to Congress on NKAO

NC1012154889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0540 GMT 10 Dec 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The people's deputies elected in our republic issued a statement. It was published in the newspaper and says:

It appears that the first session of the USSR Soviet of People's Deputies assigned to the USSR Supreme Soviet National Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission the duty of studying the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and to report its results to the USSR Supreme Soviet. However, the 28 November 1989 session of the USSR Supreme Soviet (?authorized) the commission to report to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium a draft decision on steps to normalize the situation in the NKAO. That draft was not studied in the Presidium. Moreover, the Supreme Soviet was not informed of (?its contents), it was presented to the deputies on the day it was studied, and the view of the commission was not heard.

The proposal by the people's deputies elected to the Supreme Soviet from Armenia and from the NKAO that the discussion on the issue be postponed in order to prepare a comprehensive report for later study was completely ignored. Thus, the people's deputies elected in Armenia and in the NKAO had to walk out of the session.

The parliamentary, democratic [words indistinct] (?ended its work) without reaching a suitable solution. This was contrary to good intentions and further exacerbated the situation in the region.

Another [word indistinct] is that the USSR Supreme Soviet decision was accepted immediately after the report on the Azerbaijan SSR's Constitution. Clearly, the objective is to destroy NKAO autonomy.

The deputies state that the USSR Supreme Soviet's 28 November 1989 decision is assessed as the center's capitulation to the Azerbaijan Popular Front extremists.

The USSR Supreme Soviet ended its session by believing the Azerbaijan SSR leadership's (?allegations) that it will take all the necessary steps to lift the blockade on Armenia and on the NKAO and not to allow any blockade from now on. But the blockade continues.

We appeal to the Second Session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and to Comrade Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, says the statement, and hope that the session will take (?effective) steps not to allow obstructions in the parliamentary (?process) during the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We, the USSR people's deputies elected by Armenia, are ready to participate actively in the second session of the USSR Soviet of People's Deputies and in the deliberations on decisions concerning (?the country) and our republic, and—by expressing the interests of our constituencies—to achieve a just solution to the NKAO problem.

We believe in justice and in perestroyka.

The statement says in conclusion: The USSR people's deputies elected from Armenia request that the following topic be included in the agenda of the Second Session of the USSR Soviet of People's Deputies: the clarification by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the trampling on the right of self-determination, an issue of concern to the majority of the NKAO residents, as well as on the continued trampling on the Armenian people's [word indistinct].

The [word indistinct] of the statement was accepted by the Armenian deputies' [word indistinct] on December (?8) 1989.

NKAO Administrator Volskiy Interviewed

PM0812161789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with A.I. Volskiy, chairman of the NKAO Special Administration Committee, by NOVOSTI correspondent N. Lapayeva; date and place unspecified: "Nagorno-Karabakh, December 1989"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On 28 November 1989 the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the resolution "On Measures To Normalize the Situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]." In this connection, NOVOSTI's correspondent asked Arkadiy Ivanovich Volskiy to comment on the situation in the NKAO.

[Lapayeva] Let us be blunt, the resolution was long-awaited, since the situation in the NKAO is now one of the most acute and painful situations in the country—after all, blood is being shed and people are being killed there. Before asking you the main question of how the resolution is affecting the situation in the regions and whether it is the only correct decision, I would like to ask you to somewhat analyze the progress of events once again. You have spent 500 days and night there, not least as chairman of the NKAO Special Administration Committee, and therefore you are entitled to make a knowledgeable judgment on the situation in the NKAO.

[Volskiy] Yes, soon it will be 2 years that the NKAO has been the sorest trouble spot in our state. The previously little-known oblast is now the subject of universal attention. Each report from the area causes Soviet people pain, concern, and confusion. It was in the NKAO that the country first encountered such phenomena as mass rallies and demonstrations, political strikes, blockades, and hostage-taking. It was also in this region that the tragic situation whereby blood was shed in interethnic clashes and pogroms, and refugees streamed across mountain passes, was first encountered.

Our country had no experience in finding a way out of such situations by democratic and nonviolent means—this was all the more evident as events developed so quickly and dangerously that Moscow often had to take swift measures at a moment's notice. Representatives of social organizations and the press both from our country and from abroad visited the NKAO. They came with different intentions and different approaches, but they went away with the same conclusion: There is a problem and it has to be solved. Admittedly, a single issue remained open: how to ensure that the situation did not get entirely out of control and prevent chaos.

[Lapayeva] A great many people are currently saying that the resolution of the NKAO problem has been unjustifiably delayed at the center. What do you think about that?

[Volskiy] It has become almost fashionable to rebuke the country's leadership for their sluggishness and lack of resolve over Nagorno-Karabakh. We have often heard claims that the region's problems are caused by the position adopted by the center. As if both opposing factions want only to be reconciled, and Moscow is stopping them. Having been in the thick of things for 18 months and in constant contact with our state leaders, I am in a position to state that such accusations are completely unfounded. The center has never been indifferent to the NKAO problem. Throughout this period there has been a difficult search for correct political solutions. I emphasize—political. Sometimes events took such a turn that the center was forced into tough decisions and the use of military force for deterrence and pacification. But as long as there has been the slightest possibility of solving these questions by political means, that is what has been done. Of course, this sometimes painful process was not without its mistakes, but everything is crystal clear only to political simpletons.

We also retain a relic of the idea of central power in the sense that it is claimed that if we do not know the answer to a question, the center is bound to have it. But today, under the conditions of democracy and glasnost, the center cannot stake a claim to the absolute truth or to a monopoly on solutions. It seeks them together with the people, relying on collective recommendations and assistance.

[Lapayeva] Among the numerous problems that have now been revealed in society the question of interethnic relations is particularly acute. Examples of it are provided by Sumgait, Fergana, the Baltic, the Transcaucasus, and so forth. But surely they didn't just crop up overnight?

[Volskiy] Or even yesterday. The contradictory and ambiguous decisions of the early twenties on the national-territorial makeup of the Transcaucasus led, in particular, to Nagorno-Karabakh and its Armenian majority being included in Azerbaijan. I think that the initiators of this decisions were, at any rate, not prompted by malice aforethought, but by the ideas then prevalent that in a socialist state the nationalities issue as such would quickly disappear as nations were fully amalgamated on a class basis. Nor can we forget the romantic ideas of our state's founding fathers that in a very short period there would be a world revolution, the proletariat would triumph everywhere, and borders would disappear of their own accord.

On the basis of this theory, the main factor in the country's national-state makeup was economic. And if you analyze the position of autonomous oblasts and okrugs on the map, you will see that they are all included in republics or krays which could be, as it were, economic sponsors for these smaller peoples and give them support in their socioeconomic development. Obviously, that was not the worst decision at the time. And if we were able to ensure a substantial leveling out of living standards among most of the country's backward peoples, it was largely thanks to this approach. But this created an additional basis for theories which hold that the nationalities issue is not an independent factor but is rooted exclusively in socioeconomics.

Against the background of this theory the repeated attempts made by representatives of smaller nations in the thirties, forties, and sixties to raise the question of self-determination were rejected and ignored, and the instigators of these ideas were cruelly punished as extremists and nationalists. The overcoming of these errors was difficult even under the conditions of perestroyka. We have had to endure massive reciprocal pogroms, the deportation of 300,000 refugees from Armenia and Azerbaijan, and strikes lasting many months so as reach a more profound understanding of the essence of the question. In his interview with Central and Armenian television in December last year, M.S. Gorbachev noted that the NKAO population's social protest had been brought about by blunders in the former Azerbaijan leadership's nationalities policy. Since then the Nagorno-Karabakh issue has moved to a new stage in its resolution.

[Lapayeva] That was when the decision to set up the Special Administration Committee, which you head, was taken. Now that a certain stage of activity is behind you, has your opinion about the necessity of this measure at that time changed?

[Volskiy] I think that the introduction of the special situation and the setting up of the Special Administration Committee were the most important measures taken by the country's leadership to solve the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. I recall that the decision was seen by the Soviet public, politicians and statesmen abroad, and the world's press as the most sensible decision in the prevailing situation. And healthy forces in both republics and the autonomous oblast realized that the introduction of this special form of administration would stop any escalation, stabilize the situation, and create objective prerequisites for solving the entire range of Nagorno-Karabakh issues. I will not talk about the committee's activity here, that would take too long. I will dwell on two important points, which I have to mention. The first is that the question of the committee's special prerogatives in the administrative sphere needs to be accurately publicized. Naturally, the committee has substantial forces of internal troops at its disposal. But these forces are used solely to protect the security of the Armenian and Azerbaijani populations. Most often they form a "fence" between the warring factions.

[Lapayeva] Forgive me, I must butt in. It is well known that there have been injuries and fatalities among the internal troops. I realize that defense of the motherland is a soldier's duty, but does this duty consist of dying from a knife in the back or being blown up in a truck carrying food or other goods for the population? I realize that it is hard for you to answer this question, but we cannot avoid the subject.

[Volskiy] It is hard to disagree with that. Our guys are having a tough time, that is why we are making every effort to avoid using force to solve the problems. During this period we have not stopped the activity of a single social organization—formal or informal—on political grounds, nor have we banned rallies, demonstrations, petitions, and so forth. All the local organs elected by the people operate in the oblast, as they do elsewhere. Only the top echelon of the oblast leadership, which was unable to control the situation, has been dissolved. We have resolutely set our sights on replacing only those who were mired in corruption and had preyed for years on the people's problems. Many honest and well-qualified cadres have been nominated, and it was planned to transfer full power to them after the coming elections. But this process triggered a stormy reaction from the "shadow power" forces which had imposed a "black" economy. This is the case in the NKAO, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. Wheeler-dealers facing the prospect of exposure launched an offensive against the committee on the pretext of national unity, and it must be admitted that this hand was skillfully played. A hysterical wave of accusations began claiming that the committee was engaged in the Azerbaijanization of the oblast, while the Azerbaijan population accused it of favoring the Armenians. It was against this wave of hysteria that the strikes and blockades that have largely wiped out everything positive were launched. Unfortunately, many informal leaders are making their contribution to stoking the conflict. There have been calls here and there for people to join "self-defense" detachments, to take up arms, to rebuff attacks, to hand out punishment, and so forth.

The Azerbaijan People's Front has declared and is "successfully" implementing a blockade of Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. The Front members are not allowing trainloads of food, fuel, and other goods into these regions. Informal and formal leaders from both Nagorno-Karabakh's communities are organizing sabotage, rock-throwing on roads, and acts of terrorism against totally innocent people.

In this situation it was not possible to fully implement our plans. Distrust of the committee started growing among the Armenian and then among the Azerbaijani population. The Azerbaijani population demanded more severe measures against the "coparticipant" in the conflict. A destructive policy was adopted by the Azerbaijani public, which stated that the Nagorno-Karabakh issue does not actually exist, that it was just scheming by Dashnak [Armenian nationalist] forces, and that the republic itself should instill order in the oblast. Official propaganda is silent about the methods proposed for achieving this. On the other hand, the People's Front leaders are openly calling for tough solutions.

Under these conditions the question of the very idea of the existence of the Special Administration Committee has been raised. I continue to take the view that this form can be used in crisis situations, but a number of conclusions need to be drawn—not least as regards the sphere of public awareness.

[Lapayeva] Incidentally, about public awareness— Arkadiy Ivanovich, my question may sound emotional, but please explain where this current escalation of malice in our country has come from. We have forgotten that we have been given the supreme asset of life, and nobody is entitled to take that away. And now that there is hope of a more human existence in this world, we have started destroying each other. Both physically and morally....

[Volskiy] If we're going to call a spade a spade, it isn't just in the NKAO but in Armenia and Azerbaijan, too, that we've been dealing with special, not yet fully understood, mass psychological stress—whereby a persistent image of an "outside enemy" is formed, compromise is seen merely as capitulation to the enemy, and all views are broken down into two categories: One view is ours, all other views are wrong.

I think that we haven't taken account of the psychological component of the people's subjectivity. In the best traditions of administrative edict-style thinking we saw the people as an object of administration who should be grateful for the benefits allocated to them. But the people want to be the subject! All our planned programs should be implemented not for them but by them.

[Lapayeva] That is undoubtedly so. Only, are we prepared for this? We are now talking about the all-European human home. We have finally realized that so much in the world is interlinked that, provided we give each other a hand, mankind can avoid ecological, economic, political, and, ultimately, moral disasters. And yet at the same time we hear: This is my house, this is my land, "don't go poking your nose into other people's business." How can this be reconciled?

[Volskiy] I would like to express my personal opinion on this issue, which is one of the most acute issues. The main difficulty now is that we have to find a compromise between the moral and political demands of perestroyka. The moral imperative as regards the interethnic sphere is to recognize each people's right to free expression, self-determination, and the humanization of nationalities policy—which is inconceivable without the primacy of human needs. The political approach is conditioned by the recognition of the fact that perestroyka now cannot risk the new state upheavals which would inevitably be caused by redrawing national-territorial borders. The destabilization of this sphere could do irreparable damage to economic and political reform in the country as a whole. There are also a number of points which determine our approaches. Above all, it is wrong to reduce the idea of self-determination merely to an opportunity for a different state (or republic) jurisdiction. This approach is highly archaic and based on historical experience when control of a territory and the existence of individual statehood were the sole guarantees of a people's survival. Hence Stalin's well-known definition of a nation as a territorial, linguistic, economic, and cultural unit.

The second point relates to the essence of the political resolution of ethnic problems. The Armenian side constantly stresses that the Nagorno-Karabakh issue is a political rather than socioeconomic issue! And "political" once again means changes to the border. But politics is always a question of power. Who power belongs to, what its prerogatives, impact, and relationships with lower and superior structures are—that is the essence!

Given this approach, resolving the Nagorno-Karabakh issue means giving the oblast's autonomy a level of independence and self-management which would protect it from any attempts to violate the autonomous people's individuality.

And, finally, the third point. This stems from the paradigm of new political thinking about the unity and interrelated nature of the modern world. The internal development of each nation in the modern world cannot proceed on parallel lines. Territorial, political, and cultural isolation lead to an inward-looking civilization. Armenia is now essentially turning into a mono-ethnic republic, which could produce well-known consequences. On the other hand, Azerbaijan's tendency to assert its own principles by force is no less dangerous. The fundamental principle of the CPSU's nationalities policy is the humanization of interethnic relations. Taking this path means recognizing the values of one's own people and other peoples in order to enjoy mutual self-improvement.

As you know, the state of affairs in Nagorno-Karabakh was discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet on 28 November. The resolution published in the press was adopted by an overwhelming majority (there were only four votes against). Speaking at the session and addressing the people's deputies from Azerbaijan, the NKAO, and Armenia, I said: "Comrade deputies! You are the conscience, honor, and reason of your peoples; their leaders, and their spiritual pastors. Who, apart from you who are trusted by hundreds of thousands of people, will be able to stop this senseless and inexplicable process of self-torture and destruction? Consider what a barbaric stain on your peoples' biographies is being left by mutual lockouts and blockades, hostage-taking, explosions, and calls to uphold national honor by force of arms. What will be left of national honor if it is covered in another people's blood?

"Consider the fact that your national intolerance threatens to politically destabilize all of society, and that your national egoism is harming the fate of perestroyka. But what will happen to our peoples if the democratic and humanistic ideals of perestroyka are wrecked?

"Very little is required of each of you: to try to understand the pain and alarm of another people. Not to pigeonhole them as Dashnak or Musavat [early 20th century Azerbaijani counterrevolutionary party] extremists, but to attempt yourselves to answer the question: Why are our fatherland brothers unhappy with my people? Is there anything wrong in our behavior? How can we restore faith and friendship?...

"I am not the only person speaking to you today. Believe me, each person in this auditorium is moved by identical feelings: pain and alarm for the fate of your peoples. The people who try to find pro-Armenian or pro-Azerbaijani motives in our heartfelt words are idiots. We have no such motives! We have a pro-human concern for you, we have love of people, we have a desire to help both peoples to return to peace. Let us travel this road together!"

I am prepared to repeat these words now, too.

[Lapayeva] Thank you, Arkadiy Ivanovich.

Azerbaijan Bureau Members Meet Republic's People

NC1112115889 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] The meetings held by members and candidate members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau with the various strata of the republic's people on 5 and 7 December were in the form of a wide-ranging and practical dialogue. Ayaz Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, held talks with the workers of the petroleum and chemical industry. Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, met with the employees of administrative organs. Tel'man Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, held talks with the workers of the agro-industrial establishments, land reclamation and water resources systems, and light and local industry establishments.

Ratib Zeynalov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, met with the members of creative organizations. Gasan Gasanov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, met with the workers of the automobile and city transportation establishments. Muslim Mamedov, first secretary of the Baku City Party Committee, held discussions with the members of higher and secondary specialized schools. Artur Rasi-Zade, first deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, met with the workers of mechanical engineering, electrotechnical, instrument (?manufacturing), and [word indistinct] metallurgical establishments. Rauf Akhundov met with the employees of the Foreign Affairs Ministry and foreign trade organizations. Naim Fataliyev, first deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, held talks with the workers of trade establishments, consumers cooperatives, livelihood services establishments, and municipal economy organizations, and Asanov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, met with the workers of the construction sector.

Open and detailed talks were held on the political situation in the republic. The situation requires effective measures, extraordinary decisions, and resolute approaches.

The meetings noted that all steadfast forces have to be reorganized and closely united for the sake of reconstruction and the democratic reformation of society. There is determination to achieve interethnic peace and truce, stabilize the situation, and strengthen the effort to carry out priority social and economic programs at the present time. It is necessary to establish [word indistinct] peace and work rhythm everywhere and increase the pace of work in order that [words indistinct] and the annual plan is realized in an auspicious way.

The meetings also examined the tasks related to the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision on 28 November concerning the practical measures required to intensify work in the work collectives and the measures needed to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

The representatives of the work collectives noted that they approved the policy pursued by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers aimed at finding a political solution to the problem, restoring the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereign rights, and reinstating jurisprudence and law and order in the region. The front for the struggle to normalize the situation and quickly resolve the accumulated problems includes each and every work collective and their party and social organizations. The communists, that is, the leading communists in particular, must strengthen the feeling of responsibility in all areas of production in every way, achieve a high level of discipline and organization, and mobilize the collectives to work with great productivity.

Situation in South Osetia Reported

LD0812205189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The editorial offices are receiving large numbers of telegrams and letters asking us to report what is taking place in the South Osetian Autonomous Oblast in the Georgian SSR. We invite you to look at some film taken where the events took place a few days ago.

As has been reported already, thousands of members of informal associations arrived in Tskhinvali, the administrative center of the oblast, with the object of holding a mass meeting on the city square to protest a decision by an extraordinary session of the oblast soviet that the South Osetian Oblast be transformed into an autonomous republic. The oblast soviet put this request to the Supreme Soviets of the Georgian SSR and of the country. However, the residents of Tskhinvali blocked the way into the town to those who had come. Several thousand people stood opposed to each other on either side. It was thanks only to servicemen of the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, who were deployed here in good time, that it was possible to prevent a clash. Nevertheless, there are dozens of injured and shooting continues. [video shows troops in uniform on road; armored cars; troops standing, holding shields; people lying injured in hospital beds]

[Begin recording] [First Unidentified man]. Can a (?normal) person do this? No decent Georgian could do this; no decent Osetian could do it, either. It is absolute extremism; done by rascals.

[Second unidentified man] The whole of our lives we have been living in peace with Georgians. This oblast here is 20-percent Georgians. We have always lived side by side with them. It never happened before that we [words indistinct]. Then suddenly, they come to us from somewhere else and set people against each other. [video shows two men, apparently hospital orderlies, speaking to camera] [end recording]

We were told at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs that by today's date, the main part of the internal troops had been withdrawn outside South Osetia. Only a small part of the detachment remained behind. This has brought about dissatisfaction on the part of the residents of Tskhinvali, who do not consider themselves secure and demand that stability be insured in this region.

Groups of armed people from the informal organizations remain in a number of villages and along the highways leading north from Tskhinvali. Unfortunately, it has to be said that distrust between the two peoples, which have lived in peace on this land for centuries, is increasing. [video shows groups of soldiers on streets, groups of residents]

Turkmen Body Debates Economy, Elects Premier

PM0712122189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Kuleshov report under the rubric "Sessions of Union Republic Supreme Soviets": "Turkmen SSR"]

[Text] Discussing the republic's plan and budget for next year, the deputies taking part in the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session stressed the following: The implementation of these documents will require particular responsibility since there is a difficult year ahead. Despite the considerable increase in retail commodity turnover, consumer goods production, and paid services, the money supply will also exceed the supply of goods in 1990. Provision has been made for R200 million to be issued.

Deputies are also seriously concerned about the state of affairs in capital construction. Fixed capital is being commissioned very far behind the prescribed schedules. Only 1 in 10 facilities due to be commissioned this year under the state order was actually commissioned in the period January-October. The republic's State Construction Commission is carrying out work at light industry facilities—the cotton weaving mill in Neftezavodsk, the knitted fabric factory in Iolotani, and so on—in an extremely unsatisfactory manner. The Turkmen SSR State Agroindustrial Committee has a shortfall of storage facilities for potatoes, vegetables, and fruit by 7,000 tonnes at any one time. Plans for the construction of housing, schools, and preschool establishments have not been fulfilled.

The 1990 plan determines steps to overcome the negative trends in the republic's economy.

The Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet session was preceded by a discussion of the candidacies for the chairmanship of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers which won the most support at an extraordinary session on 17 November. The following were included on the list: Kh. Akhmedov, first deputy chairman of the Turkmen Council of Ministers; E. Nazarov, Turkmen SSR finance minister; and K. Orazov, first secretary of Mari Party Oblast Committee. The last-named withdrew his candidacy, and a secret ballot was held after statements by the two remaining candidates along with detailed discussions of their professional and personal qualities. Kh. Akhmedov won an outright majority. The republic Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution appointing him chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers.

Kazakhstan Issues Decree on Law, Order

LD0612102189 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 p 3

["Decision of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet on the Measures for Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order in the Republic"]

[Text] The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet notes that lately the crime rate in the republic has grown considerably, and that public, state, and labor discipline has slackened. Special concern is caused by the spread of such dangerous crimes as premeditated murder, attempts at the health and personal immunity of citizens, robberies, burglaries, the theft of socialist and private property, bribery, profiteering, and other crimes connected with the acquisition of nonlabor profits. There are cases of mercenary abuses during the formation and running of some types of cooperatives.

In a number of places individual people and groups of people with extremist tendencies are trying to exacerbate the situation. They organize unsanctioned meetings, demostrations, and gatherings, at which antisocial ideas are propagandized. Citizens are incited to violate public order and Soviet laws.

Such actions are destabilizing the sociopolitical situation, undermining people's belief in the ability of the state administrative organs to protect the citizens' interests. They are giving rise to various rumours and arousing dissatisfaction among the population.

The situation that has arisen is connected to a great extent with serious shortcomings in the activity of state organs, public organizations, leaders of ministries and departments, organizations, establishments, cooperatives, collective and state farms, and labor collectives in educating the Soviet people in the spirit of respect for the law and for the established order and discipline. The organs of law and order do not assure fully the strict and rigorous observance of the laws. They show leniency and unjustified liberalism toward antisocial elements, and do not always apply the measures envisaged by the law.

For the purpose of assuring public security, strengthening order and discipline, protecting the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, and curbing crimes and other infringements of the law, the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To demand that the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Office of the Public Prosecutor, the Ministry of Justice, and other republic organs of law and order apply the established measures of force in full correspondence with the law to people violating public order, decisively suppress the manifestations of extremism, and any actions directed at rousing and stirring up national hostility and discord.

Each case of failure to act and to apply the measures established by the law to the guilty people must be considered as a gross dereliction of duty.

2. To give to the employees of the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs the right to utilize the means of active defense and special methods of suppression of anti-social behavior during dealings with criminal elements and people who grossly violate social order, disorganize the work of transport, endanger the life, health, honor and dignity of citizens and officials.

The aforesaid means may be utilized in the case where an employee of the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs has warned the person of the impermissibility of his violating the law, but that person has ignored the warning or resisted the lawful actions of the officer.

In case an assault is made on an employee of the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the means of active defense can be utilized without a warning.

3. To increase the responsibility of the leaders of enterprises, organizations, educational establishments and other establishments, and public organizations for assuring labor and production discipline; and to increase the responsibility of public order in the labor collectives headed by them.

To establish that the provision by the aforesaid leaders and other officials of premises and other state or public property (means of communication, duplicating machines, equipment, and transport) for participants of an unsanctioned gathering, meeting, street procession, or a demonstration, or the creation of other conditions for the organization and conducting of such events entails disciplinary and administrative responsibility—a fine of up to R1,000. They can also be deprived of their bonuses for a period of up to 1 year. Regardless of the measures applied, the material damage caused through the unlawful actions of these people is due to be recovered from them through a court procedure.

4. The participation of citizens in their working hours in unsanctioned meetings, street processions, and demonstrations must be considered as absence from work without a valid reason, and it entails the responsibility envisaged by the norms of the labor legislation of the republic. For these reasons their place in the housing line can also be put back, they can be deprived of bonuses and other privileges, and the length of their labor leave can be shortened by the number of days of absence.

5. The organizers and participants of unsanctioned gatherings, meetings, street processions, and demonstrations shall compensate, parallel with other measures of coercion envisaged by the laws, through court procedures the material damage caused by the unlawful actions to enterprises, establishments, organizations, and citizens.

6. The executive councils of local soviets of people's deputies must intensify their control over the activity of organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in a move to decisively suppress crime and the violation of public order. The work of temporary committees for combating crime, comrades' courts, voluntary people's squads, workers' detachments assisting the Militia, and other public formations must be made more active. The councils of labor collectives must be advised to give material and moral incentives to workers who take an active part in the protection of law and order.

7. The republic Ministry of People's Education and its local organs must raise the level of upbringing work among students at higher and secondary specialized educational establishments. The leadership of the Ministry and the leaderships of the establishments and educational establishments falling under the Ministry's jurisdiction must be made personally responsible for the state of this work.

8. The organisms of law and order and the executive councils of the local soviets of people's deputies must take decisive measures to curb the plundering of state and public property, profiteering, violations of the rules of trade, and the malpractices in the activity of individual cooperatives.

9. The Kazakh SSR Ministry of Justice, ministries and departments, and executive committees of soviets of people's deputies of the republic must increase the work in legal education in collectives, and the propaganda of law among the population.

10. The mass information media must elucidate in depth and truthfully the situation in the republic vis-a-vis law and order, and the progress in implementing mesures to combat crime. They must impart to the citizens the

feeling of respect for the law and the need to support the activity of the state organs in strengthening law and order.

11. In connection with the adoption of this decision, the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium must make the appropriate amendments in the legislation of the Kazakh SSR.
[Signed] M. Sagdiyev, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
[Signed] K. Zhusupov, secretary of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Moscow City Party Holds Plenum 8 Dec

Prokofyev Delivers Report

LD0812162589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Dec (TASS)—Political theses for elections to republican and local soviets, and the fulfillment of the critical remarks and proposals expressed by delegates at the 27th City Party Conference were discussed by a plenum of the Moscow City Party Committee which took place today.

Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the CPSU's Moscow City Committee, made a report. He noted that the upcoming elections will effectively complete the formation of a new political state structure, the transfer of decisive power to the soviets, and will advance in real terms the political reform.

The communists of the capital are becoming involved in the struggle, realizing the immense responsibility before the party and all Muscovites. Time demands a realistic, clear, and definite political position of the Moscow City Committee on all fundamental issues.

Appealing to the electorate, the city committee declares its firm support for a policy of democratic renewal of the Soviet state, and toward the implementation of economic and political reforms. There is no other path ahead.

We do not intend to idealize the processes occurring in society and to close our eyes to our general difficulties and to our own mistakes, the speaker continued. It is clear that, embarking on restructuring, the political leadership of the country has presented it, evidently, in the form of a serious, but nonetheless, cosmetic overhaul. When it came to conducting really radical changes, we acutely experienced a shortage of time.

The economic reform began without due preparation. A series of erroneous and hasty decisions has evoked distortions in developing new forms of management The current state of the Moscow economy is confirmation of this. Restructuring has proved to be weakly elaborated in the ideological sphere. As a result, the ideological and political positions of the party have weakened, and the influence of the communist outlook and of socialist ideals has narrowed.

Populism, whereby some people are attempting to pass off insincere promises and to play upon the heightened feelings of the electorate, has become a new phenomenon in public life. We resolutely refuse to promise the people mounds of gold; we propose instead a difficult but realistic program of action that is based on calculations, and we openly state what the capital's communists are for and against. The "Progress-95" comprehensive territorial and branch program, which was elaborated at the initiative of the CPSU's Moscow City Committee, is the economic part of the city party organization's election policy.

The leader of the capital's CPSU organization expressed hope that the more than 1 million detachment of Moscow Communists is capable of uniting at a difficult time for the party and the country. He stressed that our goal, along with all progressive forces, is to achieve election to the soviets of deputies, who are ready to use power efficiently, honestly, and responsibly for the benefit of all Muscovites. We will support each candidate who agrees with the fundamental goals of restructuring, who recognizes the socialist choice of the country, and who speaks against the destabilization of society. Consolidation of all healthy forces and goodwill are needed. It is not important by whom a candidate was nominated, but it is important who precisely is nominated and what his intentions are.

After an acute and democratic discussion, the plenum mostly approved the political theses for the upcoming elections. They will be published.

The plenum condemned the campaign of addresses and dissemination of rumors which aims to create a split in the Central Committee, and expressed its moral support for the line of carrying out the revolutionary restructuring of socialist society, its democratization and humanization, and the establishing of real people's democracy. The plenum called on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee Politburo to demonstrate firmness and self-possession, not to take premature, ill-considered political decisions in this complex sociopolitical situation.

The appeal of a number of USSR people's deputies to carry out a political strike before the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies was discussed. It was stressed that this represents inadmissible pressure on the highest organ of power in the country and an attempt to turn back the formation of a law-based system.

The participants of the CPSU Moscow City Committee Plenum expressed confidence that the capital's Communists and all Muscovites will resolutely oppose irresponsible appeals whose implementation may lead to extreme economic and political instability.

Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the work of the plenum.

Plenum Condemns 'Rumors' About CPSU

PM0812212989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondents S. Bogatko, Yu. Kazmin report: "Checking Positions"]

[Text] Moscow—A plenum of the Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom] was held yesterday. It defined the main tasks facing the city party organization in connection with an important political campaign—the elections. A report was delivered by Yu. A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom. The action program proposed by the gorkom was submitted for broad discussion in primary party organizations.

The capital's Communists are aware of their responsibility at the present stage of perestroyka. The situation in society is complex. There has been a narrowing of the communist world outlook and socialist ideals. There are outbursts of mass emotions and narrow group actions by the most diverse trends, including openly antisocialist trends. The time demands a clear, realistic, definite stand by the party gorkom. Its platform must answer the most serious questions of the day and define an action program for the elections and the long term. Appealing to the voters, the plenum stated its firm support for the policy of democratic renewal of the Soviet state and the implementation of economic and political reforms. Only through concrete action and by operating on the basis of democratic norms will the party win the right to a vanguard role in society.

The plenum participants urged the capital's Communists to display political maturity and the ability to unite their efforts at this difficult time for the party and the country.

The discussion at the plenum was sharp but constructive. It made it possible to more clearly define the strategy and tactics of Communists in the election campaign. When preparing the most important Central Committee decisions, speakers noted, it is advisable to comprehensively discuss them in primary organizations. They expressed the opinion that all Communists must play a more active role in the election of leading party organs and delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Speakers expressed concern that party organizations are still lagging behind in restructuring the style and methods of their work and that inertia has not been eradicated. That is what happened with the drafting of the theses—they should have been discussed earlier. This would have allowed party organizations to define their positions in good time and more actively prepare for the elections.

A most important concern of Moscow Communists today is to strengthen by practical action the vanguard role of the capital's party organization in resolving the tasks of socioeconomic development and of making more effective use of the city's intellectual potential. This should be done primarily by creating powerful material and moral incentives for honest, good quality work in every workplace.

The Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum approved in the main the political theses on the elections as a basis for further broad discussion and preparation of a specific platform of action.

The plenum condemned the campaign of comments [vystupleniya] and of the spreading of rumors designed to split the Central Committee. It expressed its principled support for the policy of implementing the revolutionary perestroyka of socialist society, democratizing and humanizing that society, and establishing real people's power. The plenum urged the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to show steadfastness and endurance in this complex sociopolitical situation and not to make hasty, ill-considered political decisions.

It condemned calls by a number of USSR people's deputies for a political strike on the eve of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. It stressed that this represents intolerable pressure on the country's highest organ of power and is an attempt to reverse the formation of a rule-of-law state.

Participants in the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum expressed confidence that the capital's Communists and all working Moscow will give a determined rebuff to irresponsible appeals whose implementation could lead to extreme economic and political instability.

The Moscow Gorkom plenum named several candidates for the vacant elected office of party gorkom secretary and conducted a preliminary discussion of the nominations. It was decided to continue the discussion in the city's primary party organizations. Candidates will have the opportunity to address meetings, speak to the press, and set out their programs, views, and positions. The gorkom will reach its decision at the end of December on the basis of this "open meeting" of Muscovites.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, took part in the plenum.

Theses on Deputies Elections

PM1112120189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report by A. Gamov: "With a Sense of Responsibility. Moscow CPSU City Committee Plenum Adopts Political Theses for Elections of People's Deputies"]

[Text] The general atmosphere in the Moscow CPSU City Committee [gorkom] hall of sessions yesterday was determined by the first and, perhaps, most important item on the agenda of the latest plenum of Moscow party gorkom: "On the political theses for the elections of people's deputies to republic and local soviets." The brief—lasting no more than 40 minutes—but full report by Moscow CPSU Gorkom First Secretary Yu.A. Prokofyev, which was in essence a commentary on the politial theses which had been presented for debate, set the scene for a serious, principled discussion. Indeed, the times demand a realistic, clear, and definite political stance by the party gorkom on fundamental questions of the day, one which will determine a program of practical actions for the elections and for the future.

"When addressing the electorate we must declare our firm support for the line of democratic renewal of the Soviet state and the implementation of economic and political reforms," Yu.A. Prokofyev said in his report. "There can be no going back. Either we go forward or we fail utterly. Either we take the highway of social progress or we stay on the periphery of civilization. We do not intend to indulge in wishful thinking, idealize all the processes taking place in society, turn a blind eye to our common difficulties and our own errors. It is clear that in embarking on perestroyka the country's political leadership pictured it as a serious but nonetheless cosmetic overhaul. But when there emerged the determination to carry out really radical changes we felt badly short of time."

Naturally, in the report and in the majority of speeches—and more than 20 party gorkom members or guests mounted the platform that day—there was a keen analysis of the complex political and socioeconomic situation in the capital.

Of course, solving the problems is not easy. But the conclusion on this score at the plenum was reassuring: When entering into the struggle for the right to be represented in organs of Soviet power, you have to set the task of preventing any aggravation of the contradictions between the social goals of perestroyka and the condition people actually find themselves in.

Many of the speakers were worried about the weakening of the party's ideological-political positions. The influence of the communist philosophy and socialist ideals has narrowed. The "vacuum" is being filled by representatives of various political currents that are alien to true socialism. They are looking hard to establish their own social base and are doing their utmost to widen it. There was a resolute appeal at the plenum for an end to the game of political hide-and-seek and a clear statement of what we are for and what we are against. It is no accident that the draft political theses say, in particular, that Moscow CPSU Gorkom is against individuals and groupings who are using perestroyka slogans as a cover for their efforts to monopolize glasnost and appropriate the right to speak for the whole people and who intend to discredit our socialist gains. This position was also approved by the plenum participants.

A new phenomenon in public life is populism, whereby certain people make frivolous promises and play on the highly charged feelings of the electorate, it was noted at the plenum. We, however, resolutely refuse to promise the people pots of gold. We are offering instead this difficult, but realistic, action program, based on calculations.

The plenum demonstrated that Moscow's more than 1 million Communists are capable of uniting at what is a tough time for the party and the country. It set the task of joining all progressive forces in securing the election to the soviets of deputies who are prepared to use power effectively, honestly, and responsibly for the benefit of all Muscovites.

After a fierce, democratic debate the plenum basically approved the political theses for the upcoming elections. They will be published.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the plenum's work.

Slyunkov Chairs CPSU Socioeconomic Commission

LD0812201789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] On 8 December a meeting of the commission of the CPSU Central Committee on socioeconomic policies took place. It was chaired by Comrade Slyunkov. The members of the commission discussed comprehensively the report on measures to make the economy more healthy, the stages of economic reform and the fundamental approaches to drawing up the 13th 5-year plan, which has been presented by the government to the Second Congress of People's Deputies. The commission supported the main provisions of the report. However, a series of specific proposals on this matter were made. Particular attention at the meeting was devoted to next year, in the opinion of those who spoke, should be the year of extraordinary measures to stabilize the economy. It was stressed that the transfer to self-financing and self-government of all union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts will be an important, constituent economic reform.

Commission Discusses Economic Reform

LD0812232389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1918 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Dec (TASS)—The problems of deepening radical economic reform and basic approaches to forming the plan for the 13th 5-year plan were discussed today at the latest sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Issues of Socioeconomic Policy which took place under the chairmanship of Nikolay Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Opening the sitting, Slyunkov stressed that the state of affairs in the national economy remains exceedingly complex. In connection with the fact that state influence on the provision of national economy ratios has been weakened, complications have arisen, primarily on the consumer market and in the sphere of finances and money in circulation. It was underlined at the sitting that it is possible to cope with the existing difficulties only by means of accelerating economic reform and close coordination of the 1990 plan and the future 5-year plan with radical transformations in the economic mechanism.

The commission supported the basic premises of the report put forward by the government for the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies. At the same time, a number of solid proposals were expressed regarding means of extricating the country's economy from its present state. Particularly stressed was the necessity of setting in motion the mechanism of enterprises' financial autonomy as soon as possible.

The sitting paid special attention to 1990 which, in the opinion of those who spoke, should be a year of extraordinary measures to stabilize the economy. The main task the entire 13th 5-year Plan aims to solve is the saturation of the consumer market.

It was stressed that an important component of economic reform should be the transfer to self-financing and self-management of all the union and autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts beginning in 1991.

Attendees Named

LD0812212189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A regular sitting of the CPSU Central Committee commission on questions of social and economic policy took place today under the chairmanship of Comrade Slyunkov. Under discussion were problems of the further deepening of the radical economic reform and principled approaches to the formation of the plan for the 13th 5-year-plan period. Taking part in the sitting were Comrades Maslyukov, Biryukova and Vlasov; and Comrades Abalkin and Sitaryan, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers. A detailed report on the sitting of the CPSU Central Committee commission will be published in the press.

Ligachev Talks With West Siberians

PM1012121189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 89 Second Edition p2

[TASS report: "Meetings on Siberian Soil"]

[Text] The most diverse questions of life and perestroyka were discussed at meetings that Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR people's deputy had in labor collectives and with social organizations in Tyumen and Tomsk oblasts.

The visit to Western Siberia was connected with monitoring implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution on the results of the 1985 visit to Tyumen Oblast by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Particular attention was devoted to improving working and social conditions and supplying the population of the oil and gas extracting regions of Tyumen and Tomsk oblasts with food. The leaders of a number of ministries and departments, oblasts, cities, collective farms (kolkhozes) and state farms (sovkhozes), and oil and construction organizations took part in the conversations.

There was a lively discussion at the third oilfield of the "Surgutneft" Oil and Gas Extraction Administration. N.A. Pavlov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, works here as operator responsible for oil extraction.

"What is the mood among oil workers, Nikolay Antonovich?" the Central Committee secretary asked.

"The mood is one of work—we produce oil. But the working and living conditions need to be improved. We have no intention of going on strike, as we believe that things will get better."

It transpires that a steady supply of foodstuffs and consumer goods is not being ensured. The furniture situation in the north is bad: You get an apartment and have nothing to furnish it with.

"There is now too much emotion and not enough action in the country," the workers present said, joining in the conversation. "Exactingness as regards plan fulfillment, output quality, and cooperative supplies has waned. You can see the kind of shortfalls that exist in the country's oil supply, but there is no real concern, not even in the central press or on television. Economic methods are not yet working full strength, and party and state bodies have slackened their efforts in this direction. The result is that what used to gather dust on stores' shelves is now considered as scarce commodities. Why do the 'higher-ups' in Moscow attach no importance to this abnormal situation?"

Ye.K. Ligachev explained to the oil workers in detail about measures to increase the output of consumer goods and foodstuffs. At the same time, he said what is often said: We will be patient, wait, and see. Restructuring is now under way and the people are actively involved in the management of society's affairs and the affairs of their collectives. Consequently, the stand taken by everyone must be more definite, more specific, and—most important of all—more active.

The oil workers remarked that during these years social issues have begun to be resolved better than before but that there is still work to be done. The state will doubtlessly send the Siberians food, but food production in Siberia, at local level, must be developed more vigorously. Good possibilities for this have now appeared.

"Yegor Kuzmich, we would like to ask you a question as a USSR people's deputy from the party. What is your personal attitude to the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution? I would like to ask you about this because we have talked about it and discussed it a great deal amongst ourselves," A.S. Kokarev, a fitter of control and measuring equipment, began his question thus—a question which developed into a speech. "We have reached the conclusion that there is no political force in our country other than the Communist Party that is capable of leading restructuring and ensuring the solution of all political, economic, and social tasks. What do you think?"

"I am of the same opinion. I believe that a multiparty system in a multiethnic state cannot serve the task of strengthening the Soviet federation."

"We have cases where Communists are handing in their party membership cards. How should this be regarded?" was one question asked at a meeting with the party aktiv in the Surgut city party committee (gorkom).

Ye.K. Ligachev replied that, naturally, every instance of a party membership card being surrendered should be given individual, careful attention. Now more than ever before, we need unity in our ranks, unity of the whole party, and Communists must work together hand in hand—then we will be able to overcome the difficulties which have arisen. Leaving the party at a difficult time, giving up leading work, and attempting to wait and see, sit it out, and then adapt to the new situation is nothing new—it has happened before. The real Communist is the one who fights for the party cause. He does not surrender his membership card. We have to strengthen confidence in everyone.

At the meetings with oil workers, builders, and agricultural workers in Surgut, Nizhnevartovsk, and Strezhevoy, in the "Sibkabel" Association in Tomsk, and with the Akulov family from the "Tyumenskiy" Sovkhoz, the participants actively discussed questions connected with enhancing economic efficiency: In industrial and agricultural collectives, the Siberians are introducing economic accountability relations, the lease system, and contracts. In this respect, an interesting discussion was held in the workshops of Tomsk cable workers.

"Three of our workshops are cooperatives and five operate on a lease system," V.A. Ostroukhov, USSR people's deputy and secretary of the association's party committee, said. "Economic and social results are growing. We are working toward the situation where the association will become a cooperative of lease collectives."

The Central Committee secretary was surrounded by women workers. They said that life in the collective really is different now and that people feel they are in control of matters and work conscientiously. Initiative is no longer a slogan but reality. At the same time, they asked a great deal of questions concerned with social and political life in the country and the rest of the world. They asked: Why do we hear endless horror stories from rostrums and the television screen about impending catastrophe, chaos, revolution, and even starvation? We can see a whole group of people who are cunningly exploiting the shortcomings in our country and engaging in political intrigues and careerism. Why are they still in the party? Why are they being helped by some of the mass media? We want to live and work with confidence and have peace of mind for ourselves and our children. Why is there so much irresponsibility and unscrupulousness in conditions of democracy and in the use of glasnost?

The participants in the meetings and conversations—and there were a good many of them in the course of the week—endeavored to convey their thoughts and opinions to the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR people's deputy.

Ye.K. Ligachev's meeting with scientists, teachers, members of artistic and creative unions, and students at Tomsk University was attended by members of the city's informal organizations, who played a prominent role in the proceedings. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee answered numerous questions from the intelligentsia. At the end, he was handed a written question:

"Can you not arrange a meeting with representatives of the 'democratic public'?"

"But are the people present here not representatives of the democratic public?" Yegor Kuzmich asked, which caused a stir in the auditorium.

Ye.K. Ligachev was accompanied on his visit to Tyumen and Tomsk oblasts by G.P. Bogomyakov and V.I. Zorkaltsev, first secretaries of the oblast CPSU committees.

Yeltsin Chairs Interregional Deputies' Meeting

LD1012154989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1452 GMT 10 Dec

[Text] Moscow, 10 December—TASS parliamentary correspondent Iigor Galkin writes:

An animated debate was evoked at the 2-day general meeting of the Inter-regional Deputies' Group (IDG), which ended today, by the address to the population by five of its members who called for a general 2-hour-long political warning strike to be held on Monday, 11 December. The aim of this action as indicated by the authors of the address—including historian Yuriy Afanasyev, Co-chairman of the IDG; Economist Gavriil Popov; and Academician Andrey Sakharov—is to force the congress of USSR People's Deputies, which opens on Tuesday, to include the adoption of laws on ownership, land, and several other laws, on its agenda.

Several resolutions—from the adoption of the address as a document of the whole group, to complete dissociation from it—were proposed at the meeting of this group of deputies, who have gained a reputation for being radicals. Vladimir Zubkov, a deputy from Rostov-na-Donu, asserted that there is a political watershed between deputies with regard to this address. He demanded an expression of solidarity with the authors of the address. Deputy and writer Aleksandr Gelman said: "Pressure is being applied here, offensive attacks are being made on those who do not agree with the address. At the same time, calls for a strike in no way take into account today's complexsituation in the country." Deputy Yuriy Bondarev, referring to numerous meetings with his voters, gave his assurance that the working collectives of Leningrad would not support a strike.

Overt apprehensions could be heard during the discussions: that the matter should not go so far as a split in the Inter-regional Deputies' Group. All the more so when 180 members of the group took part in today's meeting, while it is unofficially reckoned that it has almost 400 member deputies. Co-chairman of the IDG Boris Yeltsin, warning against a split in the group, advised those taking part in the meeting to refrain from reproaching those deputies who express their disagreement with the call for a strike. As a result, a compromise resolution was worked out which acknowledges the right of every member of the IDG to independent political actions in the interests of radical democratic transformations. The Inter-regional Deputies' Group called on all voters to express support for demands to include on the congress agenda questions about Article 6 of the USSR Constitution (on the leading role of the CPSU), ownership, land, the press and local selfgovernment, "in the resolutions of gatherings, meetings, letters, cables, and other forms".

Many problems of the country's life today were discussed at the meeting. In the deputies' view, only the adoption of laws affecting matters of ownership, the state enterprise and land use can turn restructuring into an irreversible process. Alarm could be heard in the majority of speeches in connection with the worsening of the country's economic situation and the lowering of the population's standard of living. There was a proposal to draft their own draft of economic transformations, as an alternative to that of the government, which would accelerate the functioning of new economic mechanisms, based on the independence of enterprises and market relations. Displeasure was expressed at the fact that the process of democratizing society is too slow.

The Inter-regional Deputies' Group today discussed on-camera tactics of behavior at the forthcoming congress of USSR People's Deputies that opens on 12 December.

Lukyanov Radio Interview, Part 1

LD0912162889 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Part one of interview with Vice President Anatoliy Lukyanov, by Moscow radio "special correspondents" Aleksandr Plavako and Vyacheslav Terekhov, at the Kremlin in Moscow; date not given—Lukyanov's remarks, in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation, are recorded throughout; questions by Plavako and Terekhov are read by announcer]

[Text] [Lukyanov] The congress convenes at a crucial moment, I would even say at a turning point in perestroyka. It will naturally focus on ways of promoting restructuring. High on the agenda will be the questions of how to stabilize the national economy, what stages the current reform is to go through, and what criteria should be employed in drafting the next 5 year economic development plan.

Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Soviet Union's Council of Ministers, will give an account of this situation. I think that this question is one involving our economic development, the deepening of reform, and the continuation of the whole, complicated, difficult, multifaceted work in the sphere of economic life. It will form the basis of the issue that will be debated at the congress. This will be the basis of the resolutions of the congress.

All other issues, though they may be very important, will be subordinate to this main question. We will in essence turn half of the congress's work, in time, to the debate of this.

[Question] In your opinion, on which issues can the fiercest debate develop?

[Lukyanov] It would be easier to say on what there will not be debates. I think that there will be debates on all issues, starting with the agenda and ending with the reports of the relevant committees. As is known, these committees were formed at the first congress. But, the (?relations) of deputies to the issues, the nature of the dialogue taking place in society, the debates, the appearance of various standpoints—all this shows that there will be a lively debate in essence on all issues submitted to the congress.

[Question] Extensive debates have been going on in the West over the stand adopted by the interegional deputies group. Some have suggested it may advance its own platform or come up with initiatives of its own. Many have been viewing the group as an opposition organization. How does Anatoliy Lukyanov see the role of the interregional group, and are there any other parliamentary factions influencing the Supreme Soviet's performance?

[Lukyanov] Lately public attention has been called—and not without assistance from the national media—to the activity of only one group of parliamentarians, the interregional deputies group, which incidentally has a very heterogeneous structure and involves people of different views and orientations. The media seems to have overlooked the fact that there are other major factions within parliament—the agrarian group, for one, which has made a number of suggestions on the agenda for the congress; or the workers' group that has been increasingly vocal of late. A serious influence on parliament and the congress has been exerted by the ecological faction, as well as the groups of female parliamentarians, veterans, and younger people.

In fact, the Supreme Soviet consists of a variety of stable groups pursuing their specific interests and having platforms of their own. The female parliamentarians, for example, have advanced a number of suggestions that are expected to be discussed soon not only in parliament but also in the cabinet and elsewhere. Their suggestions were written down in a draft resolution on improving the position of Soviet women.

Younger parliamentarians have come up with a draft law on the youth, a major project that may require multibillion allocations. The environmentalists have worked out a draft resolution on improving the ecological situation in the country, a resolution which was recently passed by the Supreme Soviet. The interregional group, which has been criticizing various things rather extensively, has notably advanced fewer constructive suggestions than any other parliamentary faction.

[Question] Is it likely that congress' work will be concluded in 12-15 days?

[Lukyanov] The congress itself will decide how long it wants to work, but in theory local council elections will be held in two Baltic republics on 10 December and on 24 December, 2 weeks later, in Kazakhstan and Tajikistan. Naturally these two election campaigns of great significance restrict the congress to time limits, and according to signs it must finish its work by then. Although, as I say, the final word will rest with the congress itself.

General Denies Danger of Military Coup

AU1112115189 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 8 Dec 89 p 2

["W.A." report on interview with Colonel General Dmitriy Volkogonov on Deutschlandfunk Network on 6 December: "I Pray for Gorbachev"—place not given]

[Excerpts] Frankfurt, 7 December—"As a convinced supporter of perestroyka I pray that God helps Gorbachev and grants him a sizable success." These were the words used by Moscow's leading military historian, Colonel General Volkogonov, in an interview with Deutschlandfunk Network in reaction to the question concerning the internal conditions in the USSR. The head of the Military History Institute at the USSR Defense Ministry admitted that there was nothing of the sort of "positive conditions." Although Gorbachev's efforts for restructuring had a favorable foreign political effect, the Soviet citizens will "begin to believe and have confidence" only once sizable social and economic improvements begin to show. According to Volkogonov recurrent rumors that the man in the Kremlin is facing the danger of a military coup is without any foundation. He said that this is out of the question and that as "Soviet colonel general" he stands by this statement and "is completely convinced of it." [passage omitted]

Colonel General Volkogonov, who has been trying for quite some time to fill in the so-called white spots of Soviet historiography, and who, after his biography on Stalin just appeared in a German edition, is now planning to write a biography on Trotskiy, does not conceal that the elimination of Stalinism in the USSR continues to cause difficulties. On Deutschlandfunk he was quoted as saying that "we are ridding ourselves of Stalinism in dribs and drabs." In the view of the military historian it was one of Stalin's greatest crimes to have educated an entire generation not to take things into their own hands but to wait for instructions. Concerning the state of the Soviet Armed Forces, Volkogonov said that troop reductions and cuts in nuclear arsenals "do not exactly increase the Army's authority." The soldiers' main concern is to achieve more social security. The Armed Forces must become "more professional," Volkogonov noted, adding that although the Army is "poor" the dissatisfaction among its members is not exaggerated. There are only a few who feel that they are not treated fairly and are left in the lurch. Subsequently the military historian said that "more democracy is necessary " even in the sphere of the Armed Forces.

Asked about current developments in eastern central Europe and about former military interventions in the GDR, Hungary, and the CSSR, Volkogonov advocated a "new assessment and a reassessment" of history.

Anniversary of Gorbachev UN Speech Recalled

LD0812192789 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's address at the United Nations on December 7, 1988, has provided a diplomatic and practical platform for the Soviet Union's actions to democratise and humanise international relations and to enter an era of peace, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Sergey Kislyak told a briefing here today, the anniversary of Gorbachev's address to the world community.

People in the Soviet Union noted with satisfaction the interst shown by the world in new thinking, emphasised in the address. New thinking seeks to remove ideological restraints from inter-state relations, to emphasize the supremacy of the common human values, to recognise the freedom of choice and the existence of various ways of social development, to ensure solidarity and stability in the world and to conduct a dialogue on this basis.

The world community was virtually unanimous in its response to Gorbachev's call to regard efforts to avert the global threat to the environment as equal to the military and political priorities of security. The initiative for the establishment of an emergency environmental aid centre within the U.N. is being widely discussed.

Gorbachev's U.N. address since its delivery has served as a programme statement for the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

An impetus has been given to negotiations on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive arms of the Soviet Union and the United States.

A serious businesslike dialogue is developing at the negotiations of 23 and 35 states in Vienna.

The true amount of the Soviet Union's military budget was stated. Plans for its reduction were advanced. The conversion of military industries to civilian production is proceeding in the Soviet Union.

Kislyak said that by November 1, 1989, as a result of reductions made, the volume of Soviet armaments in Europe had been decreased by 7,120, tanks, 2,964 artillery systems, 735 aircraft.

The desire is growing in the world to settle conflicts by political means with the vigorous participation of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union will continue to operate actively on bilateral and multilateral levels and will use a whole range of political measures to impart a new quality to international relations, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

'Smooth' Diplomatic History Claim Rebutted

PM0712133389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Letter from L. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Britain, in response to IZVESTIYA article of 17 November, followed by editorial comment, under the rubric "Follow-Up to IZVESTIYA Article": "Letter to the Editorial Office"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Editor:

Having read Comrade Plutnik's article in your newspaper of 17 November, I would like to make use of my right to reply and ask you to publish this letter of mine.

The newspaper raised the requisite and correct topic of what happens to cadres who have served in various posts for many years or maybe even decades in the party and state apparatus, acquired tremendous work experience, and felt the burden of mistakes and deformations pressing down on them. What is happening to "old cadres" now? We are urging one another to be more humane, and it is now time to think about those people who want to work, who can work, and who possess the necessary party experience to do so. Perestroyka needs people, and it is a shame that the author takes on the role of deciding who is needed by society at the time of perestroyka and who is not. I believe that there can only be one criterion here: How a person reacts to perestroyka, and what he is doing for it.

To illustrate his concept Comrade Plutnik cited for the most part a number of names linked in one way or another with work at the USSR Foreign Ministry. I want to say right away that the comparison of the diplomatic service with a "cesspool" or a kind of "cushy job" indicates a narrow-minded approach. I believe that I can talk about this because I have spent my life at the USSR Foreign Ministry and in other bodies closely linked with our state's foreign policy.

I would like to take this opportunity to answer the doubts about my "lack of professional training" that newspaper readers may have, according to the writer of the article.

I did not come to the diplomatic service "from the farm" but from an aviation factory. In 1946 I graduated from the Higher Diplomatic School and began to work in the most lowly diplomatic post as an attache. I was proud to be awarded the rank of USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in 1963 when still a young man.

I have succeeded, I hope, in spending my long diplomatic life benefiting my country, while at the same time in a very interesting way for me personally. What was I, like hundreds of other Soviet diplomats, defending all these years? Allow me to answer this question with a question: Could we ever have divided the history of Soviet diplomacy into the diplomacy of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Andropov, and Gromyko? No, we did not and could not do that. The Soviet diplomatic service has implemented and does implement the Soviet state's foreign policy. Probably no one would consider it too trite of me to repeat that our people's peaceful life for several decades after a destructive war was the result of that policy with all its difficulties, mistakes, and turning points. Nor has the policy of new thinking, which is now becoming global before our eyes, sprung up out of nothing. Many years of work lie behind it. Convinced, bold, and resolute people raised the question of restructuring everything that was impeding forward movement. At the same time we rightly talk about preserving everything that enriched us in our past diplomatic initiatives and still does so.

Certainly, I did indeed defend the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963), the Agreement on the Limitation of Strategic Arms (1972), and the Helsinki Act (1975). I am also proud that I took part in their elaboration and in many other international talks.

Yes, I did indeed defend the Soviet Union's foreign policy in front of a foreign and Soviet audience. In his article Comrade Plutnik obviously forgot to mention that this was the time of the "cold war" and there were no easy problems and questions, just as there are none today in our diplomacy.

As for my current work, it was no great trouble for the author of the article to make inquiries at the USSR Foreign Ministry, or to ask at the Soviet Embassy collective in London about how it works and what role the Soviet ambassador plays. Whether deliberately or not, he failed to do this, and a journalist's competence is at issue here.

I am profoundly convinced that the USSR Embassy in London is one which puts the new thinking into practice in a creative and confident manner—as applied to Britain, this involves the overall concept of a new Europe and the British-Soviet aspect.

I want to say in your newspaper that I am prepared as ambassador to give an account of my work both past and present to state and public bodies and the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission, if deputies deem it possible.

Yours respectfully,
[Signed] L. Zamyatin, London.

From the Editorial Office.

This letter is one from the large mailbag that we received in response to our publication of the article "Opportunity for Cadres Who Decided Everything" (IZVESTIYA No 322). It is not of course the most typical, which is natural if you bear in mind that the writer is an interested party, so to speak. But it is precisely for this reason that we decided to acquaint the readers first of all with the letter from L.M. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Britain. We consider it our duty to respect anyone's right to express dissent from a particular article in our newspaper.

As for the substance of the letter, it does, in our view, provide considerable grounds for polemics and reduces a fundamental question—the significance of which the author also points out—to a specific, personal level. We would like to stress with complete clarity that, realizing the futility of specific recriminations against specific people, the editorial office did not intend in the least to wound, offend, or hurt anyone with hindsight or to leave perestroyka without cadres.

It was a question of something above self-esteem and ambition, above, if you like, individual cases and personal incidents. Namely the practice of appointing and displacing officials, long established and still not overcome. Cadre policy, which was previously a deadly secret, cannot be implemented now without taking the public reaction into account and without taking care to ensure that everyone understands every appreciable cadre movement. This policy's implementation has a substantial effect on party prestige, and that is why its logic must be clear to the masses.

Of course, everything treated in the article by no means relates solely to the diplomatic sphere, and this was pointed out unequivocally there. Everyone is aware that even today by no means isolated examples can be found at any level and in virtually any area of the same people being reshuffled around various leading posts. Someone who was head of municipal services yesterday is transferred today "to the trade unions," someone who failed to cope with trade is given control of agriculture, and so on and so forth. The circle of people who seem capable of showing their worth in any leadership post is still too narrow and closed. This practice acts as a barrier barring the way to new people—enterprising, energetic, people who yearn to reveal their capabilities more fully in a major social field—into the sphere of government. It is no coincidence that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies marked, in particular, the appearance of new names and faces.

However, we deem it necessary to dwell on one provision of the letter, since our disagreement with the author is of fundamental significance in this case. L.M. Zamyatin firmly insists that we never divided the history of Soviet diplomacy into the diplomacy of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Andropov, and Gromyko. But how correct is it to claim that there was and is a unified diplomatic service, which "implemented and implements the Soviet state's foreign policy"? It is not perhaps necessary to be a professional diplomat to note the vast fundamental difference between yesterday's and today's diplomacy. No, perestroyka by no means inherited Brezhnevian diplomacy, just as it did not inherit many other traditions of the stagnant period. It was not such a smooth transition from past to present as the esteemed author tries to tell us. That is probably also why we describe perestroyka as a revolution, because it exploded many habitual approaches, many cliches, and stereotypes, notably in the sphere of international policy. And remember that it was the break with existing norms and ideas, along with the drastic turn to new political thinking, which helped us secure substantial successes in the international arena.

No, the article was not a matter of what the esteemed author of the letter reduced it to. It was a question of how the fate of the radical and truly revolutionary changes which the party and the country have undertaken depends on transformations in cadre work and the quality of the cadres nominated for key—and not only key—posts!

Letters Support Starkov, Editorial Staff

90UI0176A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 48, 2-8 Dec 89 p 3

[Collection of letters from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY readers: "The Words of Support"]

[Text] We express our support for the course of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in defending the principles of democratization and glasnost and its courageous opposition to the attempts of the conservative wing of the party apparatus to implement the command-administrative style of management with regard to the press. We approve the bold stand of the editor in chief Starkov and like-minded people. We are with you, as well as 31 million subscribers.

[Signed] On behalf of the collective of KALININSKAYA PRAVDA Editor V. Kirillov, Secretary of the Party Bureau Deputy Editor Ye. Shimin, Chairman of the Trade Union Committee Department Chief V. Fedulov, Secretary of the primary organization of journalists Executive Secretary A. Vikhrov; on behalf of the oblast organization of writers Ye. Borisov.

To Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet M.S. Gorbachev; to the Board of Znaniye Society; to the editorial office of the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

We, the employees of the M.V. Keldysh Institute of Applied Mathematics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, are concerned about reports in the mass media on the planned changes in the leadership of the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and express our support for the editorial collective. The objectivity of the materials published, the attained standard of glasnost, and the current topics selected are a fruitful influence on developing the processes of perestroyka and democratization in our society.

Having subscribed to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, more than 30 million of Soviet people have voted in favor of the policy pursued by its editor in chief V. Starkov and his colleagues, and no echelon has the right to cancel the results of this vote.

We hope that political tactfulness and respect for the opinion of the masses of readers prevail in the resolution of this issue.

The appeal was adopted at a meeting of the institute employees on 28 November 1989.

Signature sheets for the appeal were signed by 266 employees of the institute.

The editorial collective of the magazines SHAKHMATY V SSSR and SHAKHMATNYY BYULLETEN support the demand of the editorial collective of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY to retain Comrade V.A. Starkov in the post of editor in chief.

The behind-the-scenes attempt to replace the editor in chief of the most popular publication in the country looks like a typical manifestation of the administrative-command system. We hope that the Board of the All-Union Znaniye Society, an authoritative public organization, appreciates the responsibility to the people which it assumes in the course of resolving this issue.

[Signed] Collective of the magazine SHAKHMATY V SSSR, a total of 13 signatures.

We, the journalists and other creative arts employees of the Gorkiy TV Station, are extremely concerned about the situation which has emerged on account of the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

Is it not clear that the decision someone has made on the removal of the editor in chief runs counter to the opinion of 31.5 million subscribers (as far as readers are concerned, they are 3 to 4 times more numerous!) and that of the editorial collective which has given its vote of confidence to the editor? If despite public opinion the command method of resolving conflict situations prevails this will mean that our appeals to the people to think and live in a new manner are not worth anything.

The weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY is too popular a publication to have its fate determined without taking public opinion into account. This would be imprudent and would do great harm to the prestige of perestroyka.

What concerns us in this episode is not just the fate of V.A. Starkov, not just the fate of the most popular publication in the country, but also the oppressive feeling that the methods of the time of stagnation are coming back and snuffing out the beautiful endeavors of perestroyka.

[Signed] 78 signatures

We consider impudent pressure on the editor in chief of the newspaper ARGUMENTY I FAKTY to be outrageous toward the end of the 5th year of perestroyka. Almost 32 million newspaper subscribers for 1990 have given a peculiar vote of confidence to the editorial board of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. We entirely approve of and support the position of the newspaper.

[Signed] Skornyakov, Rotko, Germanov, Bagrov, Vaganov, Nikulina, Mlotin, Mlotilina, Marushchenko, Sazonov, Alibayev, Vasilyev, Borisov, Lozovskaya, Belov, Lozhkin, Vaganova

City of Kostomuksha, Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]

We believe that the editorial board and the leadership of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY are capable of appreciating the remarks addressed to them and draw the necessary conclusions. We are certain that these remarks should not be reflected in any manner in the personnel composition of the ARGUMENTY I FAKTY leadership and should not bring about what we customarily refer to as "organizational conclusions." The overall orientation and effectiveness of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY have been tested by our complex time. The popularity of the publication and the confidence of the readers in it, including our confidence, allow us to express our support for the colleagues from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

[Signed] On behalf of the editorial collective of the magazine, ARKHITEKTURA SSSR Editor in Chief V.S. Tikhonov

On behalf of 1,300 people, the Krasnoleninsk Expedition has sent a letter to the CPSU Central Committee expressing its confidence and support for the editor V. Starkov. We call on all readers to join our appeal.

[Signed] City of Nigan, KNGRE [Krasnoleninsk Research and Geological Survey Expedition], Rudin

We call on the Supreme Soviet to prevent reprisals against the newspaper which is one of the progressive defenders of the democratic movement emerging in our country.

We believe that these actions play into the hands of anti-perestroyka forces interested in all the revolutionary changes which our country needs so much remaining mere words.

We are certain that if we allow these reprisals to happen an offensive by the "apparatus" against the mass media will follow, and very soon we will return to "the inviolable unity," to the colorless and non-descript press which will be safeguarding the interests of the completely discredited administrative system.

[Signed] A collective letter from the employees of the NPOMash [Machine Building Research and Production Association], (city of Reutov); a total of 207 signatures.

EXCERPT from the resolution of the meeting of representatives of the voter clubs of Moscow held on 27 November in the city of Zelenograd

...The voter clubs of all rayons of the city of Moscow have united in defense of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and V.A. Starkov and intend to take resolute, effective measures...

The collective of the Kapitalnaya Mine of the Intaugol Association protests administrative measures taken with regard to the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and its editor in chief V. Starkov.

We believe the activities of the newspaper aimed at expanding glasnost and reflecting various opinions of public life to be a necessary condition for the further development of democracy in our country.

We express our support for the editorial office of the weekly and its editor in chief. We wish them further fruitful work.

Adopted at a trade union conference.
Kapitalnaya Mine, 24 November 1989
[Signed] Chairman of the conference V. Gleim; Secretary N. Kashnikov

Thousands upon thousands of such letters and telegrams in support of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY are received daily not only by the editorial office of the weekly but also by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee. However, there are several letters with a special position in the mailbag. Out of respect for the principle of pluralism of opinions, the editorial office is publishing one of them.

You Deserve It...

I read your "confession" (ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No 46, "What Do They Criticize ARGUMENTY I FAKTY For?") and thought about how principled, uncompromising, and, most of all, undeservedly wronged you are. It's like if you were not around the sky would fall in. As I understood, the goal of the "confession" is to call on us, the 31.5 million people, to protect you from being wronged by "highly placed" readers. Perhaps—I am almost certain—many people will be taken in by your appeal.

I am an engineer, and, perhaps, it is difficult to count me among the "highly placed" readers. At the same time, I also believe that your weekly serves up a very lopsided account of events in our country and is catching up fast with MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in this regard. You boast your popularity—we have 31.5 million subscribers. But what is popularity all about? After all, the "Intergirl" which you have mentioned hardly attracted less attention on the part of viewers and readers. This is how it turns out: Let's go further, morality be damned, the people like it.

Perhaps, you do not see it over there, but as a reader I cannot fail to notice the monopoly of certain persons and views set forth in your weekly, especially in reporting on political events...

As far as the renewal of the editorial board is concerned, this, to my mind, can only do good. "Teamwork" is more dangerous in editorial offices than anywhere else. It may happen that with the arrival of new forces the newspaper will not only lose nothing but will also win due to, say, propagating patriotism, honor, and dignity of the people, social justice, the quality of labor, and other notions which have now been depreciated through your efforts as well.
[Signed] P. Kislyakov, Moscow

Removal of OKTYABR, MOSKVA Editors Viewed

90UN0424A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 49, 6 Dec 89 p 1

[Report on interview with S. Mikhaylov, chairman of the board of the Writers Union of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent: "Let Us Highlight the Principal Points"; date and place not specified]

[Text]

A decision was reached at a 29 November meeting of the secretariat of the SP [Writers Union] of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] to discharge the editors in chief of two literary journals from their positions: A. Ananyev and M. Alekseyev of OKTYABR and MOSKVA, respectively. A LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent asked S. Mikhaylov, chairman of the SP board, to comment on this decision with respect to the recent extremely sharp debate going on around the journal OKTYABR and, in particular, about its editor in chief.

[Mikhaylov] Let's highlight the principle points. The decree on the replacement of the editors of the journals OKTYABR and MOSKVA issued by the plenum of the RSFSR SP board was only supposed to confirm this decision. Without the concurrence of the plenum, the secretariat is in no way authorized to discharge persons from or assign them to a position such as editor in chief of a literary journal.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] And the fact that, as has become known, A. Ananyev was removed when he was absent—is this legally justified?

[Mikhaylov] In this case, the presence of the editor in chief was desirable: I personally warned Anatoliy Andreyevich about the fact that a meeting of our secretariat was to make a decision on the OKTYABR question. He categorically refused to attend.

As for the debate around the journal itself... It began with the publication of a letter in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA from I. Shafarevich and two of his coauthors, which, I must say, appeared during my absence. In it, I was reproached personally. But this is not the problem.

In recent years, unquestionably very important works of Russian literature and social and political journalism have appeared on the pages of OKTYABR. Among these can be included articles written by the editor in chief himself. However, such publications as "Walks with Pushkin" by Abram Terts (No 4, 1989) and "Everything Passes" by V. Grossman (No 6, 1989) aroused the indignation of a wide circle of Russian readers. In this connection, we wanted to consider the work of the journal at one of the regular meetings of our secretariat. Such considerations are conducted regularly, and I think that in this case, they could have brought clarity to the ongoing discussion. But the editor in chief and the members of the editorial staff of the journal did not come to this or to subsequent secretariat meetings, or even to the plenum.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] Then, you believe that if A. Ananyev or his coworkers had agreed to attend the meetings of the secretariat and the plenum, the editor in chief of OKTYABR would have been given an opportunity to continue his work?

[Mikhaylov] I think that their appearance would have dotted the "i's" and crossed the "t's"; it would have removed the tension, and, perhaps, it would have modified the tone of many speeches. Because, in our time, the sociopolitical and literary journals publish much that at times evokes bewilderment. But if such a thing happened with any other journal, I am confident that the collective of the editorial office, its editor in chief, and the editorial board would have been able to find the civic courage to assert their positions not behind the walls of the Writers Union. As a rule, we should consider the work of others more frequently as well, not just Russian journals in which material is published that needs editing and refinement of ideological positions.

Of course, the decision on replacing the editors in chief of OKTYABR and MOSKVA (incidentally, M. Alekseyev himself submitted a statement about his resignation) is normal work in the renewal of the editorial collective with younger forces. But the discharge of the editor in chief of the journal OKTYABR was in many ways promoted by the extreme position of A. Ananyev himself and of the editorial collective, which literally undertook an all-round defense. At the same time the press carried a large number of announcements in which their author, including the editor in chief himself, allowed themselves to make insulting statements aimed at the Russian secretariat, accusing them of persecuting the journal. Moreover, OKTYABR reprinted a collective letter from KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE written by a group of cultural figures, among whom were also USSR people's deputies, which appealed to the editor of the journal to remove the masthead statement "Organ of the SP of the RSFSR" and to withdraw from among the Russian journals. This could not help but sound like a challenge.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] Many well-known Soviet writers, the socioliterary independent movement "April," and the Leningrad writers' association, in any case a large part of it, expressed their position with respect to OKTYABR, appealing "not to return to administrative methods of resolving literary disputes." What is to be done with this?

[Mikhaylov] It is now a time when public thinking comes to the surface in the most diverse forms. For us, the word "strike" has become a usual word. But if you examine the categorical position of the OKTYABR journal, then it will not stand up to any kind of criticism. The Writers Union is a creative organization and the plenum of the board of the RSFSR SP is an assembly of representatives of the literature of the peoples of Russia elected by a congress, and consequently a decision of the plenum is not an administrative decision. It is the will of the representatives of literary circles of the Russian Federation, among which there were people's deputies of the USSR, the RSFSR, and the autonomous republics.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] Thus, the secretariat of the board of the RSFSR SP appointed new editors in chief: B. Krupin (the journal MOSKVA) and V. Lichutin (the journal OKTYABR). And what are readers to do who actually voted with their rubles for the program submitted to subscribers by the same OKTYABR journal back in the subscription period, and, in particular, those who voted on the pages of our newspaper under the rubric "And What About You?"

[Mikhaylov] I suppose that the question about what to print will be decided independently by the new editors in chief both of OKTYABR and MOSKVA. Obviously, given a reasonable approach to the content of the editorial portfolio, many of the announced works could be published. But then the future relationships of the editor with the readers will depend on his policy and literary taste. Both B. Krupin and V. Lichutin are not new to literature.

Commenting on the decision that was made, USSR People's Deputy A.A. Ananyev said:

"I believe that this decision was an illegal action on the part of the board of the RSFSR SP. I do not accept the charge of insulting Russia either on my account or that of the journal. I am amazed at the silence on this question by the USSR Writers Union."

Mailbag Reveals Anti-Intellectual Sentiment

PM0712100589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[IZVESTIYA letters desk editor Yuriy Orlik review of mailbag: "Intelligentsia and Intelligence"]

[Text] "It is the rotten intelligentsia's dirty work"—this is how Ivan Balabukh from Narva explains why we are going through a difficult time. And in general, judging by the mailbag, but not only the mailbag, there are quite a few people who share his opinion.

Dislike of the intelligentsia in our country has historical roots. We will not go into them now. It is, however, a fact that the idea is firmly ingrained in people's consciousness that the intelligentsia is an unreliable, spineless, constantly vaccilating stratum which doubts everything and is inclined toward a petit-bourgeois mentality. In general, it is not to be trusted. Similar views are also reflected in the home-made poster "Down with the Abalkinization [as published] of the Economy!" sported by a picket strutting up and down in front of the building where a scientific and practical conference on the economic reforms is being held. They can also be sensed in calls made at rallies demanding that the color of the party cards of individual deputies be checked, and in certain articles where the "man of labor" is pitted against the "Motley public" as the bearer, simultaneously, of political wisdom and political vigilance.

The United Front of Working People [OFT] displays a guardedly suspicious attitude to the intelligentsia. Such moods were also reflected in a number of speeches at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet session which discussed the law on elections to the republic and local soviets.

"Under the specious pretext of the inadequate representation of workers and peasants in the USSR Supreme Soviet, and as if to counteract it, the OFT has put forward the idea of electing the bulk of the deputies from production-based okrugs"—F. Gedeon from Kolchino, Mukachevskiy Rayon, Transcarpathian Oblast, writes. "This creates the impression that our present deputies have been elected not from among the working people, but from among the bourgeoisie, as it were. All this can only be interpreted as an attempt to put up barriers to stop the intelligentsia from getting through to the organs of power."

V. Kordyukov from Chekhov, Moscow Oblast, is trying to work out the reasons for the diminished representation of workers and peasants in the present USSR Supreme Soviet (they currently account for 18 percent of the total number of deputies). "Confidence in the working people has been undermined by the fact," he writes, "that in past years their representatives in the supreme organ of power unanimously approved everything. Many people remember how, in the name of the working people, reprisals against the intelligentsia were staged, how Zoshchenko and Pasternak were denounced (although it is true that their fellow writers did not behave any better). And even now some people are trying to regain lost positions, claiming to be acting in the name of the working people. No! Enough is enough!" Muscovite E. Kosmachev shares this view. "Since when has it been the prerogative of a specific social stratum to determine the merits of a deputy?"—he writes. "For more than 70 years representatives of the working class and the peasantry were in the majority in our soviets. What have we gained from that? And what about the fact that as regards living standards we are lagging far behind countries in whose parliaments not a single worker is represented? What we need now more than ever before are people with ideas, people with real suggestions how to get out of the impasse. What's the use of turning against the intelligentsia, against intellectuals in these circumstances...?"

It is by no means a question of "showing the workers their place—on the shop floor," although undertones of such arrogance are audible in some of the letters. In the majority readers object only to election privileges. "I disagree with those," S. Medvedev, leading economist at the "Sverdlovskmelioratsiya" association, writes "who claim that workers cannot count on winning the elections in territorial okrugs and that therefore need a 'back door' to the local soviets in the shape of production-based okrugs. This would have sounded convincing as recently as last June, but since the miners' strikes, which have shown how organized the workers are and how able they are to defend their interests in the square, in front of the television camera, and in direct negotiations with the government, such views appear naive, to say the least."

Readers draw attention to the fact that the second half of the 20th century has changed the very content of the concept "working class." Its structure, numerical strength, and—most important—its place and role in social production have changed. These are by no means the people who have nothing to lose but their chains.... "The time of the supremacy of the hammer and the sickle in the creation of material values is past," Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor A. Solomonov writes from Minsk. "Therefore in the present circumstances the verbal proclamation of a special claim to the leadership of the country on behalf of one social group appears artificial. Collective reason must rule the country and the world, and workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia—all are in possession of part of this wisdom."

Essentially, it is a question of broadening the social base of power and providing it with the best possible intellectual backup.

Readers attribute our lag with respect to the developed capitalist countries precisely to our distrust of intellectuals, to the distrust inherent in the cadre policy under which posts are filled with appointees rather than experts. "An essential precondition of the existence of a monopoly on power is standardized, cut-and-dried thinking," L. Golyas, deputy chief of the Volzhskiy Motor Vehicle Plant production administration writes from Tolyatti. "Its result and ideal is the selection of mediocrities." This is borne out by the words of Academician V. Vernadskiy about "the lowering of the moral and intellectual level of the party compared with the average moral and intellectual level of the country" which, as V. Veretennikov, a scientific staffer from Leningrad, writes "we have become aware of (are becoming aware of?) too late at such great cost."

The calls "to keep out the intelligentsia and its placemen among the deputies" have to be viewed against this historical backdrop, in which the intellectual poverty of the management apparatus is obvious to everyone.

Incidentally, there are plenty of attacks on "the thickheads in the Supreme Soviet" in the mailbag: "All they want to do is to show off in front of the public"; "they are trying to pull the wool over people's eyes, they do not know what they want themselves"; "it's a veritable talking-shop." V. Gordiyenko from Moscow expresses his dissatisfaction with the work of the deputies in a satirical story where "the giants of thought, erudition, and oratory take turns at the rostrum," where "the right fights the left, the right and left fight the center, and the right and the center fight the leftist radicals," while "unprecedented quantities of goods, including perishable goods, pile up at the railroad stations and river ports." How does the story end? You have guessed, of course: "I propose that every deputy should head the struggle to save the harvest in his area, making use of his powers." It is possible, of course, to treat this as a joke. The main thing is not to follow the advice of the author of the story. Deputies have not been vested with powers in order to unload freightcars, they have been given them in order to elaborate the laws which alone can rid the country of situations of this kind. And, what is more, they have the more difficult task. We are not about to ease the deputies' burden that way.

Today we hear the voice of the intelligentsia not just in parliament and in scientific auditoriums. More and more frequently it can be heard in the streets and squares, and shouting from newspaper pages fresh off the press. Representatives of the intelligentsia are heading powerful social movements. Many of them, particularly the people's fronts, have included the words "in support of perestroyka" in their titles. And readers note that it is important to really assist perestroyka "rather than try to earn prestige by employing populist demagoguery or fanning nationalist and chauvinist attitudes" (L. Shatokhin, Khabarovsk). Teacher V. Sirko from Kiev Oblast calls on the intelligentsia "to be bearers of good, rather than of hatred and strife." Here I would like to add a few words to the readers's statements about the "irreconcilable positions" occupied by certain of our sociopolitical and literary publications. "Thank goodness that different flowers bloom in our cultural garden—OGONEK, NASH SOVREMENNIK, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and MOSKVA," D. Maklakov, A. Kasimov, and R. Arastov write from Kazan. "As distinct from foodstore shelves, the choice is wide here. It seems to us that if one press organ is slammed, all others are likely to suffer. Journalists be vigilant! Protect the variety of species." Leningrad engineers V. Komovskiy, N. Boytsov, and V. Titov are less complacent in their assessment of the "literary polemic." They believe that the heavyweight and the lighter journals are doing what they can to maintain an atmosphere of confrontation, to divide society into "champions" and "opponents." There are persistent and systematic efforts to make us believe that those who share the views of OGONEK or NOVYY MIR, for instance, are our kind of people, are "clean," while those who, God forbid, read NASH SOVREMENNIK, or MOLODAYA GVARDIYA are "unclean." Every journal has turned into a bastion of like-minded people, as it were, who closely follow the publications issued in the "enemy" camp. Not one mistake, not one inaccurate phrase or line in "the other side's" journals goes unnoticed or unpunished. You get the impression that the sides are less concerned with the fate of perestroyka and more concerned with how to hit the "ideological opponent" hardest. "Staging a head-on clash between those whose views and stances differ can hardly be described as a pluralism of opinions," the authors note. "The time has come to stop the undignified backbiting in literature," B. Voskoboynikova from Novorossiysk insists. "In the past," she recalls, "Shukshin [writer 1929-1974] asked sadly: 'What is happening to us?' Indeed, what is happening to us, and in particular to our literature? You pick up a journal and you, the reader, feel ashamed for the authors." "Some journals are overtly propagandizing anti-Semitism," S. Sheleshnev from Ryazan specifies. I would like to note that all these letters arrived at the editorial office before the debate at the latest plenum of the Russian Writers Union board became public knowledge.

The reader from Novorossiysk is right: One feels ashamed for the authors.

Deputy Minister Cited on Information Policy

PM0712145589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy by diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin: "Absurd Bans Are Being Lifted"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] For decades we have lived fencing ourselves off from the world with a wall which has held back and carefully filtered the influx of information from outside. We had become accustomed to this unnatural situation and were no longer surprised when further restrictions were introduced. The situation is now changing radically. We are returning to universal general human values and we are comparing our achievements (with and without inverted commas) with the world standard. We took a sideways look at ourselves, so to speak, and puzzled questions came thick and fast. Why can foreign newspapers and journals only be read in the special stores of libraries? Why do we have no opportunity to view Western television? Why do xeroxes remain under the strictest ban? Will this continue for long?

The talk between IZVESTIYA's diplomatic correspondent and USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy began with these questions.

[Petrovskiy] We are standing on the threshold of fundamental changes. There is already the USSR Council of Ministers decision in principle to bring our information practice up to the level of all-European standards. The Soviet Union is thus implementing the Vienna accords and confirming in deeds its intention to turn Europe into a "continent of glasnost and openness."

A package of measures is being elaborated which will make it possible to overcome our information isolation from the rest of the world. For instance, the government has agreed that it is essential to ensure the free sale of foreign periodicals in the Soviet Union. The selection of newspapers and journals will be considerably expanded (compared with the extremely limited selection offered today by the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks).

Institutions and organizations (including cooperatives) will be allowed to subscribe to foreign journals and newspapers. Payment is in hard currency. Individuals with hard currency savings will also be able to subscribe. The following option is also possible—the subscription will be taken out by a foreign partner or by friends or relations living abroad.

[Yusin] When will these rules come into force? People are no longer able to subscribe for 1990 so probably only in 1991?

[Petrovskiy] Probably, yes.

[Yusin] Will the result not be that shortcomings in the work of the Ministry of Communications, about which so much has been said and written, will reduce a good intention to nothing? What is the point in subscribing to a daily newspaper if it reaches the addressee several weeks late (as letters arrive from abroad today)?

[Petrovskiy] There's no denying there are plenty of complications. The Ministry of Communications has to resolve many problems in the remaining months.

[Yusin] Is it possible to subscribe to emigre newspapers and journals and will they be distributed freely in the USSR?

[Petrovskiy] Why not? Any publications can be distributed and sold unless they contradict constitutional norms and legislation existing in the country—that is unless they call for the violent overthrow of the existing system, propagandize war, racism, pornography, and so forth.

[Yusin] And what can people do who cannot afford to subscribe to foreign periodicals or buy them regularly—to all appearances the price will be substantial?

[Petrovskiy] The USSR Ministry of Culture has been instructed to ensure free access for all those who want it to the foreign periodicals distributed in the Soviet Union—in libraries, reading rooms, and cultural and information centers.

[Yusin] And what about xeroxes?

[Petrovskiy] Enterprises, institutions, organizations, and individual citizens will be allowed to use copying equipment for copying any materials.

[Yusin] That is the bans are being lifted and it will now be possible to take a xerox abroad, for instance?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, after the relevant laws has come into force (and that will I hope happen quite soon) people will be able to buy a xerox abroad or in the USSR and install it in their own home.

[Yusin] What other fundamental changes await us in the sphere of information policy?

[Petrovskiy] Soviet people will be able to receive foreign satellite television programs. Any organization or individual will receive the right to acquire a special aerial and install it on the roof of a house and watch U.S. or, for instance, British television broadcasts. The government has already instructed the relevant departments to elaborate by 1 June 1990 design solutions for the installation of "satellite aerials."

[Yusin] But these aerials are not produced in our country. How are we to find a way out of the situation—buy them abroad?

[Petrovskiy] That option is not ruled out. But I hope we shall be able to set up the production of these aerials in the Soviet Union.

I should like to touch on one more aspect. We are preparing to adopt new rules which will make it easier to organize brief trips to the USSR for correspondents from abroad. So far a foreign journalist has been able to visit our country only at the invitation of some Soviet organization. Correspondents will soon receive the right to visit the Soviet Union even without an invitation—if the professional need to do so arises. A 2-week deadline for arranging entry visas is being established—the same rules exist in other European countries.

[Yusin] Will restrictions on freedom of movement for foreign journalists on Soviet territory remain?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, in the United States, the USSR, and a number of European countries the closed zones regime still exists..

[Yusin] How soon will the implementation of the decisions which have been taken begin?

[Petrovskiy] There are many obstacles on our path. We often have to overcome departmental barriers and struggle against relapses into the old thinking in particular institutions and organizations.

But despite all the problems we cannot stop halfway—it is necessary as much as possible to accelerate the implementation of the decisions which have been taken. The more rapidly we renounce yesterday's stereotypes and assimilate the rules of civilized information exchange, the higher the prestige of our state and our perestroyka will be in the world and the more confidently the process of renewal within the country will proceed.

Scientific

Baykanur Space Center 'Deception' Revealed

AU0812123689 Paris AFP in English 1208 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] MOSCOW, Dec 8 (AFP)—The Soviet space center at Baikonur does not exist and never did, MOSCOW NEWS has reported.

The space center, from which most Soviet space flights were said to have been launched, was given a false name to comply with the Soviet Union's official practice of secrecy, said the weekly in its latest edition.

The deception came when the Soviet Union was asked for the center's name by the International Aeronautical Federation (IAF) in order to register the historic first manned space flight by Yuri Gagarin in 1961, the paper said.

The IAF was told that the launch was from the Baikonur Center, near the railway of the same name and close to the city of Dzhezkazgan, in central Asia.

"All this is false," the MOSCOW NEWS said.

"The Baikonur Center does not exist. The keepers of state secrets thought that by disseminating false information they would foil potential enemies."

The "Baikonur site" is really at Leninsk, in the Syrdarya River region of central Asia, several hundred kilometers southeast of the imaginary center.

Soviet scientists had always used the real name, Tyuratam (Leninsk), among themselves, despite the "legend of Baikonur," the paper said.

Secret Nuclear Power Station Regulations Criticized

PM0512152789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by A. Illesh: "Law 'For Official Use Only'? Why the Public Is Unable to Find Out the Principles Governing the Siting of Nuclear Power Stations"]

[Text] Following the Chernobyl accident a wave of rallies and actions swept the country. Basically, what they were doing was protesting against the counstruction of nuclear power stations. A debate flared up between nuclear experts and "greens" and it is still going on. The latter reckon that nuclear power harms the environment and people's health. The nuclear experts claim that these fears are exaggerated, whereas the damage caused by other sources of energy—state regional electric power stations, hydroelectric power stations, and heat and electric power stations—is entirely real and, alas, considerable.

What is the problem, then, and why the incomprehension? Why do people turn a deaf ear, and who is going to arbitrate between the public and the experts? But arbitrating between opponents and supporters of nuclear power stations... is very difficult. Why? Because in our country (unlike all the developed and most of the developing countries) there is still no sound legal basis for the development of nuclear energy.

In the United States a law on the utilization of atomic power was adopted in 1954, before the first station was even launched. We have built and are operating 16 nuclear power stations—45 units—without a law. It is true that a draft law was recently elaborated on the use of nuclear power in the USSR, but it has been doing the rounds for 2 years now.

It is also true that there is a multitude of legally binding normatives regulating various aspects and stages of the entire nuclear power station cycle. In particular, soon after the Chernobyl disaster, "requirements relating to the siting of nuclear power stations" were hurriedly drawn up and in 1987 were coordinated with all "interested departments" and approved by the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Fuel and Power Complex. This is intended to be the basic document which both state and public organizations are supposed to follow when deciding where to construct nuclear power stations. Therefore one would like to discuss it in more detail....

One would like to, but one cannot! The point is that the document is stamped "for official use only."

Note that the document did not come into being in the stagnation period, but when perestroyka was in full swing. So the natural question to ask is: Why are the requirements relating to the siting of nuclear power stations kept secret from the general public and the media? Perhaps because, despite being signed and sealed by a multitude of officials, the text of the document gives the impression that the subject has not been studied properly?

Or perhaps by stamping it "for official use only" the authors of the document wanted to limit access not to the document per se, but only to that part of it which is totally out of step with the siting of the nuclear power stations that have already been built in the country?

After all, this enables one not to report unsatisfactory results of a comparison to the public and even to the local authorities.

...The latest meeting between the local authorities and public of Khabarovsk Kray and a team of experts and leaders from organizations with a stake in the construction of the Far East Nuclear Power Station ended recently. It was the same old result—experts "for," public "against." And neither side agreed with its opponent's arguments....

In an effort to find a constructive solution in situations of this kind, the State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry proposed introducing public discussions of matters relating to the choice of sites for nuclear power stations. They will be conducted along the lines of wide-ranging hearings at which the bodies ordering stations have to publicly answer the questions of environmental organizations and members of the public.

A good idea? But remember that a court passes sentence **on the basis of laws (rules, in our case) which are accessible both to the plaintiff and to the defendant.** But in the case of the choice of a site for a nuclear power station, the basic rule is not being observed. So the proposed public hearings are merely playing at democracy according to rules which are a mystery to the public. Finally, who has put nuclear power "outside the law?" The people and departments who are supposed to be developing it. And if, as one major physicist put it, it soon becomes "somewhat cool and rather dark," it will be mainly their fault.

Belorussian Commission Discusses Chernobyl

WA0612213489 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 3 Nov 89 p 1

[BELTA report: "In the Commission of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] A regular meeting of the Commission for Cleanup Following the Accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station [AES] of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the BSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers was held on 1 November under the chairmanship of V.G. Yevtukh.

Information presented by the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman A.T. Kichkaylo on organizational measures to comply with the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] 20 October 1989 resolution "On Additional Measures To Intensify Health Protection and Improve the Material Position of the Population Living on Territory Subjected to Radioactive Contamination as a Result of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES" was heard and discussed.

In addition to the measures implemented by the republic government, it was planned to devise oblast and rayon programs within the framework of the state program for the cleanup in the Belorussian SSR following the accident at the Chernobyl AES, making provision for specific tasks to improve medical services and the population's health, including the development of a network of hospitals, polyclinics, outpatient facilities, and specialized scientific research institutes, and to provide these establishments with equipment and drugs.

Giving due consideration to the fact that for 1990 the Belorussian SSR is being allocated R2 million in convertible currency from all-union sources for the purpose of health protection for rayons subjected to radioactive contamination, provision is also made for cooperation with the USSR Ministry of Health in the near future to import essential medical equipment up to the sum allocated.

It was decided that in draft state plans for the economic and social development of the Belorussian SSR during 1990 and subsequent years, provision will be made to allocate foodstuffs for the population living on territory contaminated with radionuclides in accordance with the rational standards for the consumption of food, and also to give the population priority in the provision of industrial durables.

Ministries, departments, and oblispolkoms [oblast soviet executive committees] have been assigned the task of clarifying the demand for personal dosimeters and the targets for their production at enterprises in the republic, and to draw up proposals for the distribution of these instruments received and produced in the republic among the population and the personnel of military subunits employed in decontamination work, and of drawing up oblast programs to provide gas facilities at populated points located in regions of radioactive contamination.

Provision was made in measures to comply with the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU resolution to prepare and confirm in the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions lists of professions and duties in which workers will be given the right to receive a state pension under privileged conditions at populated points as established by the resolution, and to devise procedures and conditions for the payment of cash grants to citizens.

The oblispolkoms are obligated in November of this year to submit to the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers proposals on procedures for providing citizens who have expressed a desire to move to new places of residence with living accommodations at their new place of residence in accordance with the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU resolution and the Program for the Cleanup in the Belorussian SSR Following the Accident at the Chernobyl AES for the Period 1990-1995 adopted by the 12th session of the republic Supreme Soviet.

It is noteworthy that it is planned in November and December to deal with most of the measures stipulated in the working plan to insure realization of the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU resolution of 20 October this year, which was approved by the commission of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, and then immediately set about their implementation.

The commission meeting reviewed measures to realize the tasks for 1990 in building residential settlements, houses, and projects in the social sphere for the inhabitants of populated points as envisaged in the state program for resettlement for 1990-1991.

The Gomel, Mogilev, and Brest Oblispolkoms and the Belorussian SSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and Gosstroy [State Construction Committee] and the construction ministries and departments have been tasked jointly with the involvement of the rayispolkoms [rayon soviet executive committees] within 1 month to define for all construction ministries and organizations the specific volumes of contract work associated with the cleanup following the accident at the Chernobyl AES, and to make provision for them on a priority basis in the 1990 state plan for the economic and social development of the republic.

Planning will be accelerated for new settlements in the clean zone and for attracting projects to them earmarked for the resettlement of inhabitants in 1990-1991 in accordance with the state program adopted by the 12th session of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The commission also heard a report from the Mogilev Oblispolkom on the course of fulfillment of the 22 May 1989 Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers resolution on the resettlement of inhabitants of the villages of Chudyany and Malinovka in Cherikovskiy Rayon.

It was noted that despite the fact that at its 2 October 1989 meeting the commission of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers on the cleanup following the accident at the Chernobyl AES drew the attention of the Mogilev Oblispolkom (Comrade Ivanov) to the unsatisfactory compliance with the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers resolution on the question of resettling the inhabitants of the villages of Chudyany and Malinovka in the clean zone, the proper conclusions have still not been drawn. The Mogilev Oblispolkom has not taken advantage for this purpose of the housing built this year in the rural localities of the oblast using goal-oriented capital investments, prefabricated wood structures, and other possibilities.

The Mogilev Oblispolkom (Comrade Grinev) has been assigned the task of taking the necessary steps to comply with the assignments connected with the resettlement of inhabitants from the villages of Chudyany and Malinovka into the clean zone on schedule. Defining the advisability of using the settlement of Mayskiy in Cherikovskiy Rayon must be hastened, giving due consideration to the conclusions of the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Health and the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences in this matter.

The Belorussian SSR State Agroindustrial Committee (Comrade Sukhorukhov) together with the oblispolkoms must take steps to provide housing at those farms in the republic that have living accommodations and require manpower.

The Mogilev Oblispolkom and the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Health and the Academy of Sciences are to carry out explanatory work among the inhabitants of the villages of Chudyany and Malinovka about the need to resettle in the clean zone.

It was decided to submit the question of Comrade Ivanov's responsibility for the lack of discipline to the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers for review.

The commission meeting was attended by Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary A.S. Kamay, the chairman of the Belorussian Trade Union Council V.I. Goncharik, and the leaders of republic ministries and departments.

[signed] The Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers Information Department

Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant Accident Reported

LD0712102789 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Dec 89

[Text] Last night yet another, though trivial, accident occurred at the Atomic Power Plant Ignalina. One of the six circulation pumps in the third block developed a technical fault but the pump's performance was restored in 10 minutes time. The block load automatically dropped to 900 megawatts but within 2 hours it was brought to 1000 megawatts.

As has been announced, an international commission of experts that had (?examined) reliability parameters, ended its work last week. Though the commission's findings will be made available only next year, in all appearance the experts left Ignalina pleased. If the current accident is not taken into account the number of accidents that occurred this year is put at four; 40 accidents were registered last year and the same number the year before the last.

No firm conclusions have been made yet concerning the site of the power plant. Some seismologists maintain that the plant has been built on a tectonic crack.

Military

Yazov Addresses Moscow All-Service Assembly

PM0812154989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Dec 89 First Edition p 1, 2

[Unattributed report from All-Service Officers' Assembly: "Bearing Aloft the Honor of an Officer, Marching in the Vanguard of Perestroyka"]

[Text] An All-Service Officers' Assembly opened in Moscow 7 December 1989.

...The breath of training grounds, seas, and oceans could be felt in the Central Academy Theater of the Soviet Army where envoys of the Armed Forces' officer community have assembled. Among the forum participants are representatives of all troop categories, commanders, political officers, party and All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] activists, staff, military commissariat, military educational establishment, scientific research institute, and military mission officers. Also present are Army and Navy veterans.

Taking part in the meeting are L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, prominent military leaders, USSR people's deputies representing the Armed Forces, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], the Komsomol Central Committee, the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy [DOSAAF] Central Committee, the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans, Moscow City CPSU Committee, and Moscow City Soviet, and representatives of the KGB, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the creative unions, and the mass media.

It is 1000. After the discussion of procedural questions, the floor is given to Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, for his report.

All who are present in this hall today, Army General D.T. Yazov said, have the great honor to be the participants of the first All-Service Officers' Assembly in the history of the Soviet Armed Forces. This event marks a turning point in the development of the Army and the Navy because it is called upon to sum up, as it were, what we have achieved in resolving the practical tasks of perestroyka in the Armed Forces on a qualitative basis in accordance with the present defensive military doctrine and the principle of reasonable and reliable sufficiency. It represents an important landmark in the process of the democratization of military life which is developing in the mainstream of the renewal of our society. Finally, it is the apex of a great deal of work to revive one of the most fruitful military traditions, linked with the best pages of our motherland's military history and the glory of are arms.

The minister noted that the meaning of this tradition lies in raising and handing down—from generation to generation of people people who have chosen the defense of the fatherland as their profession—a sense of pride for the title of officer and responsibility for his good name, and of concern for officers' honor and merit—qualities which are the main guarantee for the strict fulfillment by them of their military duty. At all times, throughout history, officers in our Fatherland have taken pride in their title. "Honor is more precious than life"—this is an axiom of the unwritten officer code. In his "Regimental Establishment" and "The Science of Achieving Victory" the great Russian military leader A.V. Suvorov highlights the three main components of officers' honor. It is made up of love for the fatherland, efficiency and discipline, and comradeship. In the historical memory of the people, in their innermost notions which are not subject to the changing moods of the times, an officer is a man of honor. It is a man who is constantly ready to overcome any difficulties and privations, constantly ready to give his life for the mortherland. His honor lies in wholehearted service to the people, in the selfless discharge of the duties of Army and Navy service, in military skill, fearlessness and valor, and feats of arms.

Army General D.T. Yazov dwelt on shining examples of officer honor which abound in the history of the struggle of our country's people in defense of their native land and he emphasized the undying significance of the original formula of officer honor expounded by L.N. Tolstoy in "War and Peace" according to which the road of service to the fatherland is a "road of honor." Many glorious representatives of the military profession travelled this road in worthy fashion during the pre-October period of our motherland's history. It has been continued by commanders and commissars of the Red Army, the Army of a new, socialist, type. V.I. Lenin proudly referred to them as red officers and emphasized that it will be they "who will consolidate socialism in our Army," and that "such an Army will be invincible."

Life has proven convincingly that Lenin was right. During the years of the Civil War, hordes of crack White Guard and interventionist troops were routed. Routed under the leadership of the first red officers V.K. Blyukher, S.S. Vostretsov, V.I. Kikvidze, G.I. Kotovskiy, A.Ya. Parkhomenko, M.N. Tukhachevskiy, Ya.F. Fabritsius, I.F. Fedko, M.V. Frunze, V.I. Chapayev, and many, many other heroes. We rightly regard them as the founders of the Soviet officer corps.

Immortal examples of the skill of commanders and military leaders, steadfastness and valor, insuperable spirit, and officer merit and honor were furnished by the commanders and political officers of the Armed Forces during the years of the Great Patriotic war. N.F. Gastello, A.K. Gorovets, G.K. Zhukov, V.G. Klochkov, I.S. Konev, A.P. Maresyev, F.S. Oktyabrskiy, I.V. Panfilov, K.K. Rokossovskiy, V.V. Talalikhin, I.D. Chernyakhovskiy—it is simply impossible to cite the names of all the glorious representatives of our officer corps to which tremendous credit for the practical organization of the rout of the German fascist invadors and the Great Victory is due.

Turning to the representatives, present in the hall, of that glorious generation of Soviet officers, the generation of the Great Patriotic war, the defense minister emphasized that their priceless combat experience, their wisdom as commanders and commissars continue to serve the cause of the defense of the Fatherland and help to raise new generations of patriots and internationalists, and he expressed confidence that the veterans of the Great Patriotic War would continue to participate actively in the work of officer assemblies in units, combined units, and military training establishments, and help young people to master the high science of loyalty to military duty and selfless service to the motherland.

The strength of the relay baton of officer honor lies in the fact that its vital basis is continuity. Today it is worthily carried by commanders, political officers, and engineers and technicians who in their overwhelming majority were born after the victory in the Great Patriotic War. The speaker expressed respect and appreciation to the commanders and political officers who bore officer honor aloft while discharging their internationalist duty in Afghanistan. Their cohort in our officer corps numbers 40 Heroes. A total of 130 Heroes of the Soviet Union are serving in the combat formations of the Armed Forces. Among them are pilots, including cosmonauts, and also sailors, tankmen, artillery and motorized rifle men, sappers, and representatives of other military professions. They are the pride of our Armed Forces, the pride of our officer corps. They had to undergo grim trials and accomplish military feats—the highest embodiment of officer honor and merit.

The biographies of officers—Heroes of the Soviet Union—convincingly confirm one simple truth which must not be forgotten in the hubbub of day-to-day work and concerns. I am referring to the fact that the officer profession by its very nature presupposes constant readiness to accomplish feats. Not just in exceptional circumstances and extreme situations. Heroism exists in day-to-day work, and V.I. Lenin described this as the most difficult heroism. It is necessary to see, note, and reward in worthy fashion this heroism of tens and hundreds of thousands of officers of various titles and ranks who are conscientiously discharging their service duties in the education and raising of subordinates, in implementing alert duty tasks, or conducting the day-to-day training of troops. They are all bearing aloft the merit and honor of the Soviet officer.

The defense minister spoke about those commanders and political and specialist officers whose life and service can serve as an example for the entire officer corps. Among them are Heroes of the Soviet Union Colonel V.A. Vostrotin, and Colonel R.S. Aushev; they also include Lieutenant Colonel V.G. Karavaytsev, Colonel V.N. Bukov, Senior Lieutenant B.V. Chmelev, Captain Second Rank V.V. Lopato, Senior Lieutenant R.R. Velikaya, and many, many others. Officers of whom it can justifiably be claimed—"This is a man of duty and honor"—exist in every regiment, on every ship, in every military education establishment or institution. The key task of perestroyka in the Armed Forces is to raise all officers without exception to this level and to achieve a situation whereby the strict implementation of their duties becomes a matter of honor for each one of them.

Officers, as the vehicles of the policy of perestroyka elaborated by the party, organize the entire work for the implementation of its practical tasks in the Army and the Navy. Many of these tasks have already been fulfilled, while others are still being implemented. In accordance with the defensive doctrine, unilateral armed forces and arms reductions are being carried out, groupings in the West, East, and South are being reformed, and Armed Forces services and troop categories, integrated formations [obyedineniye], and combined units are being restructured. Much work is being carried out to enhance the combat and mobilization readiness of troops and naval forces. Important measures have been implemented in the Air Defense and Strategic Missile Forces and the Air Force and the Navy to improve the system of alert duty and to enhance its reliability. Positive changes are shaping up in the personnel's combat, field, air, and naval training. In cadre policy a course toward observance of social justice and resolute eradication of protectionism is steered consistently and firmly. Negative phenomena in military discipline are being overcome, although a radical breakthrough has not yet been achieved in this shere.

The content of the entire future work on the perestroyka of the Armed Forces is determined by the 19th All-Union Party Conference directive on the priority of qualitative parameters. Its implementation is directly connected with questions of the honor and merit of the officer which cannot be considered in isolation from his day-to-day practical work. **An officer's honor and merit materializes above all precisely in the qualitative indicators of the fulfillment of the functional duties with which he is entrusted.** And 1990, the new training year and the year of the 28th Party Congress, must mark a major step forward in the enhancement of the qualitative state of the Armed Forces.

The Soviet officer corps has tremendous political and intellectual potential. Almost three-fourths of officers are Communists. Among the officers there are representatives of more than 100 nationalities of our country. More than four-fifths of the officer corps have higher education—military, military-specialized, and general higher education. The average age of our officer corps is 32.4 years.

Unfortunately, at present this potential is by no means being fully utilized. Practical experience has shown that a relatively significant number of officers are displaying sluggishness and passiveness in respect of perestroyka, and that at a time when life demands high political and professional activeness from officer cadres, and when the development of democratization and glasnost is opening up wonderful opportunities for every officer to fully apply his abilities, inclinations, and talents.

The defense minister invited the meeting's participants to consider the question of how the existing opportunities in the Army and the Navy could be best used to raise young officers. This is particularly important also because the concepts of officer honor, merit, and military duty have begun to be eroded of late. A free-loading, consumerist mentality is spreading. Careerists, dishonest people, loafers, and demagogues can be found among officers. An uncommon, unprecedented phenomenon signals that not all is well in the officer corps—it is the desire among young officers to leave the Army. This is due, of course, to the lack of social and daily-life amenities experienced by many officers and their families. This situation is compounded by the attempts of local authorities in certain regions of late to curb the rights of servicemen, to detract from them when its comes to the allocation of housing to their families, residence permits, provision of jobs for officers' wives, and places in schools and preschool establishments for their children.

The Party Central Committee and the Soviet Government are doing all they can to improve the material and living conditions and financial situation of servicemen which is borne out by resolutions adopted in the recent past. The Ministry of Defense is taking vigorous steps to deal with the housing problem.

Naturally, worldly concerns, so to speak, cannot and must not be alien to Soviet officers. At the same time it cannot be ignored that in the clash between spiritual values—sense of duty, patriotism, and devotion to the cause of the defense of the Fatherland—and material values, the former seem to lose out, as illustrated in the case of separation requests. The causes of this imbalance between the spiritual and the material lie in omissions during the selection procedure for enrolment at military colleges, in the process of study at these colleges, in political education work directly in units and on ships, and in the military-patriotic education of the people in general.

Much attention was paid in the report to questions pertaining to ensuring an effective interaction of one-man command and democracy in conditions of the Armed Forces. The vital basis of this interaction is the maintenance of order in subunits, units, and on ships based on the strict observance of the demands of the general military regulations. Unfortunately, as practical experience has revealed, many officers are poorly acquainted with the regulation provisions which regulate the life and work of personnel, and are not sufficiently familiar with their own functional duties and the duties of those subordinated to them in the course of duty. An officer who is not familiar with the regulations is hardly likely to be able to enforce observance of the regulations in the subunit, unit, or ship entrusted to him.

Stressing the importance of the establishment and cohesion of the regimental or ship family whose nucleus is the officer collective, the defense minister noted that there are quite a few tried and tested ways of implementing this task. He focused the attention of the meeting participants on one of these ways—education based on the history of the regiment or ship, on their combat genealogy. This has the most direct and immediate bearing on officer honor. Active, substantive, and lively work centering on the combat history of regiments and ships is a most important sphere of preparations for the 45th anniversary of our victory in the Great Patriotic War. This work must be organically linked with day-to-day concern for veterans and their involvement in the educational process. Every officer must know and remember his worthy predecessors in service in the regiment or on the ship.

The defense minister placed special emphasis on the problem of the personal example set by officers. This, he stressed, is not only a moral, but also a political concern. After all, the direct impact of the personal example of officers on the prestige of the military service and the authority of the Armed Forces is entirely self-evident, beginning with their ideological maturity, professional competence, general and legal education, and ending with their appearance, drill precision, and manner of speech. The officers themselves, or in any case those among them who essentially do not treasure their honor and merit and hence also the honor and merit of the Armed Forces, must accept a considerable share of the blame for the fact that of late this prestige and this authority have been shaken.

An officer's just exactingness, principledness, high-level professionalism, unity of words and actions, drill precision, and efficiency and accuracy are conducive to the establishment of truly military order and regulation mutual relations between servicemen, relations which, consequently, are imbued with respect for the servicemen's personal merit. At the same time rudeness, tactlessness, arrogance, personal inefficiency, slovenliness, undemandingness, and indifference toward the interests and concerns of subordinates serve as a fertile ground for disorder and disorganization and lead to the emergence of preconditions for law violations. These negative features are essentially alien to an officer in the proper sense of the word. An invaluable role in the elimination and eradication of phenomena of this kind is to be played by the officer community which is called upon to create an atmosphere of intolerance toward such phenomena.

Certain mass media are trying to "mold" and instill in public consciousness an image of the present-day Soviet officer which is based on precisely such negative examples. Claims that the Army allegedly in general "dulls," "dims," and "levels" people's personality are no rarity of late either. In this context it does no harm to recall the tremendous contribution that has been made by leading representatives of the officer corps to Soviet science and culture. There are the seafarers Lazarev and Kruzenshtern, the medics Pirogov and Sklifosovskiy, the metallurgists Anosov and Obukhov, the brothers Polzunov, composers Musorgskiy and Rimskiy-Korsakov, poets and writers Lermontov and Kuprin, Dostoyevskiy and Tolstoy, Fet and Sergeyev-Tsenskiy. They all are representatives of the officer corps.

In our time the officer corps has raised and educated many outstanding sons of the Fatherland. They include the most widely-read of our writers who began their literary careers such as war correspondents Konstantin Simonov and Georgiy Markov, and Valentin Pikul who came from the Navy. Mikhail Sholokhov worked as a military correspondent during the war years. The whole country flies on airliners designed by Generals Tupolev and Ilyushin....

An important brushstroke to the portrait of the present-day officer was added by the keynote speaker describing one of the 82 USSR people's deputies representing the Armed Forces—Captain Sergey Vyacheslavovich Yastrebtsov, winner of two Orders of the Red Star. He was nominated by the personnel of his regiment as candidate deputy for the Izmailskiy territorial-electoral okrug. Voters perceived in the officer a sound, knowledgeable, and strong-willed man who was not only a top professional, but also a man of great general culture and they chose him over 11 other candidates. This experience must be borne in mind in connection with the upcoming elections to republic and local soviets. It is important to ensure that worthy representatives of the Army and Navy are nominated for these organs and that in the course of the election campaign love for the Army and nationwide respect for officers and their heroic profession are established and strengthened.

The defense minister drew the attention of the meeting's participants to one of the decisive preconditions of an officer's high prestige—his spiritual closeness to his subordinates. I am deeply convinced that this closeness is a most important component of officer honor, a norm of an officer's daily life and work, and the source and guarantee of his successes in service in peacetime and in combat. Closeness to people is the heart and soul of officer service. What is more, it is not just a question of spiritual closeness of officers and men—the fundamental basis of the moral strength and invincibility of our Army—but also of the closeness of commanders and chiefs at all levels to their subordinates. It represents not only the most difficult, but also the most precious gain of every officer because it represents the most solid and reliable guarantee of mutual respect and trust without which there is no mutual understanding nor inner unity of a military collective, nor coordination and controllability in combat.

Front-line soliders and Afghanistan veterans, in short all who have gotten a whiff of powder know what spiritual closeness between an officer and his subordinates means in combat. "Without love for his officer a soldier is an orphan, and an orphan is a poor soldier," Andrey Platonov wrote. "An officer must merit the love of his soldiers through the real superiority of his human and military qualities; only when a soldier is convinced of an officer's superiority, wholeheartedly convinced, and convinced through his love, will he find it easy to suffer with the officer and die beside him when his duty requires it."

Thanks to the spiritual closeness of servicemen a commander's order acquires not just legal force but becomes an ethical law. When both sides—the officer and his men—treasure this closeness, then deviations from regulation order are simply impossible in a subunit, unit, or ship.

But, unfortunately a certain proportion of officers are divorced from their subordinates. Why is this happening? The following can be singled out among the large number of causes. First, incompetence. Second, lack of pedagogic proficiency. Third, ethical "deafness." For these reasons an officer first of all develops a fear of contact with his subordinates and then alienation. With this is connected an ignorance of the situation in the subunit, and an inability to see and control it. Hence the preconditions for many incidents.

This is why the elimination of the detachment between officers and their subordinates and the guaranteeing of spiritual closeness between them is the key to the eradication of negative phenomena in discipline, of omissions and shortcomings in the training of troops and naval forces, and ultimately to attaining a qualitatively new condition of the Armed Forces.

Today the officer corps is faced with the task of mastering the art of working in a new fashion. The solution of this task presupposes the nurturing in officers of the qualities which determine his modern complexion.

Above all these are moral fiber, political and service activeness, and the ability to find his bearings in the ideological situation and to uphold and carry into effect socialist ideals and principles. These also include the ability to organize in practical terms the activity of the personnel, to rally the multinational collectives of servicemen together, and to effectively guide them in conditions of democratization and glasnost, and of the radical perestroyka of military structures and of the interconnections of Army and Navy life. These include professionalism which is an integral result of the mastering and practical implementation of advanced military and specialist knowledge, pedagogic skill, and legal competence. Finally these include a high overall level of culture, broad erudition, moral purity, and physical perfection.

Our military schools, the system of training commanders, and all political-educational work in the troops and fleets must be oriented toward the development of such qualities. Of course, each officer's own efforts must be geared to this. The preparation for the 28th congress of our party has the task of promoting the galvanization of all work on the education of our officers in a spirit of patriotism and internationalism and of devotion to military duty, and on forming in them clear and precise notions about honor and merit and a desire to unswervingly follow these notions in everyday service and life.

To be out in front and inspire the personnel with the aims and prospects of struggle and with a precise and clear program of perestroyka—Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, devoted his report to this subject.

Our Army, like the entire country, incidentally, is living through complex times today, he said. The variegated palette of their political colors includes an unprecedented degree of contrast, polarization, and a wide range of opinions and forecasts on the steep and thorny path of renewal.

Never before in the postwar period has interest in the Army been so universal. At the 19th All-Union Party Conference, at the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, at CPSU Central Committee plenums, and in the USSR Defense Council, the speaker pointed out, it was stated quite definitely that our Army must continue to remain a cadre army founded on the principle of compulsory military service and on the extraterritorial principle of performing service, as an international army, as an army of the Soviet peoples' friendship. This met with support in the party and among the overwhelming majority of our people.

Thanks to the new political thinking, a new military doctrine was elaborated under the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee. Precisely this, founded on the principle of defense sufficiency, was the cornerstone of the perestroyka of the Army and Navy, and our policy of qualitative parameters with regard both to hardware and military science and to the composition of the Armed Forces is the main way of implementing it.

But this is a complex, ambiguous, and very contrasting process. Perestroyka is not a one-off act, as we thought at the start of it, but a lengthy, complex, and at times even agonizing process.

The entire structure of our defense organizational development is changing. Democratization and glasnost are expanding, and their mechanisms are being created. Legal acts associated with the country's defense and the performance of military service, combat and general military regulations, and other normative acts have been and are being drawn up. Cadre policy is being renewed in line with party principles.

Let us take, for example, the renewal of cadres in the upper echelon of the military leadership. Judge for yourselves: In the space of 2-3 years the composition of the Defense Ministry Collegium has been renewed by 75 percent, and that of the commanders in chief of branches of the Armed Forces and of commanders of districts, groups of forces, and fleets by 90 percent. Analogous processes have also occurred in the composition of leading political worker cadres.

The scheme, aims, tasks, and areas of the perestroyka of party political work have been defined and it is being carried out in accordance with the Central Committee's demands. Political organs and party committees are assimilating political leadership methods and ways of influencing qualitative parameters. Their internal life is becoming more democratic. Political organs are now reporting on their work to the corresponding party conferences and receiving an assessment of their activity.

Morale and the moral atmosphere among troops and in the fleets are becoming purer. Party and Komsomol work is being turned more actively toward the person, while military councils, commanders, and political organs are undertaking new forms of work with military cadres, are helping the people being advanced by perestroyka, and are making the experience of those people common property.

The creation in the Army and Navy of a permanently functioning institution of officer self-management—the Officers' Assembly—is a new step in the sphere of the democratization of military life. This has restored one more thread linking us with our history and ensuring the continuity of the best traditions of the Russian and Soviet officer corps. In our view, each officer's responsibility to his own collective and the ensuring of honor and merit must be realized more fully in the activity of the Officers' Assembly.

Our turning to such a democratic institution as the Officers' Assembly was no accident. The officer stands at the center of the great perestroyka work under way in the Army and Navy. The officer is organizer, mentor, and educator. We have lost in the past and are still losing now a great deal because we have been unable to fully unfetter the initiative, creativity, and independence of a certain section of the officer corps. It seems to me that precisely this is the greatest and hardest, but also the most important task of the Officers' Assembly, the speaker said.

No forward movement is possible without initiative, without a vital interest in the results of military labor, without the creativity of officer cadres. Still less are revolutionary changes possible. This is why military councils, political organs, and party organizations are obliged to maximally encourage the initiative and independence of Officers' Assemblies and to enhance their responsibility and sociopolitical activeness.

A special role here belongs to Army and Navy party organizations. Communists make up 75 percent of our officer corps. Today every officer embodies, as it were, two aspects of our cause. On the one hand, he is a leader endowed with all the authority of a one-man commander and a specialist, while on the other he is a Communist, the party's political fighter.

It is not easy to be a Communist today. Some people wavered on seeing the unprecedented politicization of society, the complex processes of democratization, glasnost, and pluralism of opinions, the fierce attacks on the party, and the attempts to undermine its leading role and to cause irreparable harm to socialist foundations. Whatever post he holds, today every Army and Navy Communist must decide whether he is ready to devote all his energy to the common cause of the revolutionary renewal of society, whether he is ready to distinguish the people's real interests from all sorts of froth that has appeared on the wave of renewal, and whether he is ready to resolutely oppose the destructive and irresponsible forces which call us to borrowed [zayemnyy] values and goals.

Together with the attacks on the party and the Army there is a massive offensive against Army and Navy political organs coordinated by destructive forces. What can be said to this? There have been wreckers in the past. The first attempts to wreck political organs were repulsed by V.I. Lenin and the 10th party congress.

One wonders why some of us are in a hurry to run ahead of the locomotive. This is because political organs have always been a thorn in the flesh of all covert and overt enemies of the Soviet system, have clearly pursued and now pursue the party line in the Army and Navy, and prevent antisocialist forces from shaking their ranks, sowing confusion and weakness of will in their souls, and wresting the Army from the party and the people. There are grounds for criticizing political organs. But it is necessary now to strengthen them, to improve their work style and inner life, to turn them more actively toward the person, particularly toward the officer, and to demand of each of them utter devotion and selflessness in their work in our complex times.

"In this politically inflamed atmosphere the value of responsibility to history and the people is particularly great," M.S. Gorbachev says. Now more than ever we need unity, party comradeship, and a joint increase in our contribution to resolving the tasks of Army and Navy perestroyka.

The participants in our meeting, Army General A.D. Lizichev went on to say, include USSR People's Deputy Lieutenant Colonel V.I. Alksnis. Such Communists must be emulated. The model for his life and struggle was his grandfather—Army Commander Yakov Alksnis, Bolshevik, Red Lettish rifleman, legendary commander of the Worker-Peasant Red Army, and first chief of the Red Army Air Force. Viktor Imantovich himself is not only a good specialist in his own field, but also a Communist who has devoted his entire conscious life to the cause of Lenin's party. This enables him to serve well and wage an active political struggle against nationalism, extremism, and separatism.

Take the composition as a whole of the participants in today's meeting. Communists and Komsomol members account for 99 percent of them. Almost all have had a higher education. Some 70 percent of the meeting participants have a high rating, and more than 40 percent are members of elected party, soviet, and Komsomol organs. Many have had state awards conferred or been involved in rendering international assistance. In short, the social portrait of this assembly is to some extent a copy of the entire Army and Navy officer corps. We can be proud of it. We associate the future of the Soviet Armed Forces with such people. No winds of our unquiet age will break down such people.

But, to be fair, it should be said that some officers have recently been fulfilling their party duties without enthusiasm and losing their political fighting qualities. Approximately 30 percent of those who have decided to part with officer service are Communists. There have appeared among our officers quite a few grumblers and "mother's boys" who fear the fresh wind that blows around distant garrisons and domestic disorder.

Speaking of ways to consolidate the officer community, Army General A.D. Lizichev described as futile the attempts by certain self-styled "leaders" to organize it along the lines of some sort of "military trade unions." Speculating on the emotions of offended people cannot be a sound basis for unity. More realistic is consolidation by means of seeking constructive ways to overcome omissions, deformation, and other negative manifestations, including in the sphere of social justice. The first steps have already been taken by the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet Government, and the defense minister. You heard this in the report of Army General D.T. Yazov. It is now up to the initiative of the officer corps itself and to the Officers' Assemblies which have been created among the troops and in the fleets.

Widely known in Kiev Military District, for example, is the experience of joint work by Lieutenant Colonel N.M. Fomenko, commander of a motorized rifle regiment; Lieutenant Colonel A.U. Belopolskiy, deputy for political affairs; the party committee headed by Major V.F. Ivanov; and the regimental Officers' Assembly. For 3 years there have been no incidents or crimes there, and year after year the regiment obtains good firm assessments in the final checks. Not one officer in the regiment has applied for discharge from the Armed Forces. Tiresome and fruitless conferences have been eradicated from the work practice. Conferences are held once a week and last no more than 15 minutes. The question of regularizing the officer's workday has also been resolved here. The practice of granting leave to officers with school-age children primarily during the summertime is imbued with sincere concern for officers' families. Of course, not all questions have been resolved here—39 officers' families are obliged to live in private apartments. But young officers do not need to find them. These duties are assumed by the regiment's rear service, which at the same time ensures a moderate rent.

Unfortunately, such a work practice is not yet universal. At meetings held among the troops and in the fleets people rightly said that the Officers' Assembly must be more equitable in resolving questions of performance of service, appointment to higher posts, sending for training, recommendation for awards, replacement of officers, and so forth. I believe that these questions merit very careful study and prompt examination.

But I would like to draw attention to the morale, political, and moral aspect of the questions raised. Speaking about the Soviet Army, our remarkable writer Leonid Leonov once remarked that it lived at the limit of "material paucity," "but we were richer than anyone: The inexhaustible gold coins of youth jingled in our songs." And any battle is won by the one in whom "the flame of faith is hotter." And this, he believes, is stronger than the uranium bomb.

This is the root of the matter, the chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate emphasized. We must thoroughly step up ideological political, moral, and military education. Officers' Assemblies are obliged to foster the "flame of faith" in every officer, to enhance his party prestige, and to temper him ideologically and morally. On this basis it is necessary to foster in every officer rejection of unscrupulousness, conceit, immodesty, and smugness.

Never before in our society have the officer and the Army been subjected to such moral humiliation and such slanderous criticism in certain mass media and in verbal and printed statements. In Lithuania, Estonia, and a number of Transcaucasus and Moldavian regions the matter goes so far as humiliation of their human dignity and physical assaults. Not only against them, but also against members of their families.

Calling our soldiers and officers "occupiers," the separatists and nationalists in the Baltic and Transcaucasus republics are insistently pushing the idea of national armies and military formations. We military people well know that in the present world no one Soviet republic will be able to really defend itself against encroachments from without. On the contrary, this way of formulating the question pursues far-reaching political ends, which we have no right to overlook.

Undoubtedly, not all is well in our Army home. Even among officers there are unworthy people and even people who are simply harmful to our military cause. But they cannot be allowed to shape the image of the Soviet officer in the public consciousness.

Hence the Number 1 problem is to enhance the officer's social status. It is time, at last, to realize that an officer can be taught and educated. It is possible to criticize him and to reject and transfer to the reserve some specific officer. He must not just be humiliated—he is an officer, he is a defender of the motherland! I appeal to the USSR people's deputies, to the leaders of the mass media and of creative unions and organizations, and to the veterans of the Great Patriotic War and the Armed Forces who have been invited to the assembly: Let us together enhance the authority of the officer's profession, the prestige of military service.

But, of course, we officers ourselves must show more concern for fostering and supporting in every possible way the concept of an officer's honor. We must ensure that every officer takes pride in his rank, values his honor as an officer above his own life, and strengthens its philosophical substance. *The Red Army Man's Book*, which was edited by V.I. Lenin, gave this definition of honor: "Revolutionary military honor means awareness of one's own dignity as a revolutionary serviceman of the Worker-Peasant Red Army and as a citizen of a free country conscientiously fulfilling his duty."

In appealing to honor, Officers' Assemblies are called upon to clearly implement the party's military policy and call strictly to account those who are careless on combat duty and in combat service, who are negligent and disorganized, who study badly, and who fail to work on enhancing their professional skill. We can in no way be satisfied with the fact that during the inspection and final checks for this year as many as 40 percent of officers were assessed only as satisfactory.

Officers' Assemblies are also called upon to develop scientific thought and to place it at the service of defense organizational development. To seek and find talent among officers. Clubs of military inventors and rationalizers must be organized and function under the auspices of Officers' Assemblies. We await a real increase in work from the Officers' Assemblies of military schools and academies.

In speaking of the officer's honor as the cornerstone of military service, I will say that honor is the strongest moral stimulus of military discipline. True honor cannot tolerate laxity, arbitrariness, loutishness, and indiscipline. Every Officers' Assembly must formulate for itself clear political and organizational mechanisms for strengthening discipline. They must be based on the Leninist tradition of the command and political personnel's organic spiritual living link with the mass of soldiers and sailors. Without spiritual closeness to the soldier and sailor there is no officer. To bind to oneself the hearts of subordinates and to inspire in them love and gratitude toward oneself—this is the paramount and most sacred duty of every noble-minded commander and political worker. M.S. Gorbachev reminded us of this once again when he addressed the Main Military Council 18 October this year.

Today every officer must be capable of working in multinational military collectives. As the CPSU Central Committee September (1988) Plenum emphasized, embittered nationalism, with the bacilli of which many young people are infected before joining the Army and Navy, demands an active struggle for people's minds, for their understanding of the world, for social and spiritual guidelines. Special demands must be made today on the person of the political worker as the man and the Communist who is called upon, by dint of his profession, to be most closely linked with officers, soldiers, and sailors.

Many acute questions were raised at the Officers' Assemblies held in regiments and on board ships, and there was sharp criticism of military councils, commanders, political workers, and party organizations. Of course, some people may or may not like this. But this is an objective reality, and it must be taken into account. Political organs and party committees must recognize the Officers' Assemblies as their active partner in social life. The main path of party influence here is via Communists in the elected organs of the Officers' Assembly.

We can provide a good boost to the work of Officers' Assemblies through close collaboration with Komsomol organizations. The Army Komsomol is undergoing important renewal. The new democratic mechanism of staffing its leading organs makes it possible for Officers' Assemblies to make wide use of the potential of Komsomol organizations' exertion of real influence on all strata of servicemen and above all on young officers. The main feature in the mutual relations between the Komsomol and Officers' Assemblies is equitable dialogue between different generations of officers.

We have great traditions which no other army in the world has. We have a wonderful cohort which serves as their vehicle—these are the veterans of the Great Patriotic War and the veterans of the Armed Forces. We must seek to link the private, professional and social life of officers with the cause of the struggle of all generations of commanders and political officers of the Soviet Army and Navy.

An important place in this respect is also occupied by women's councils. They contain great organizational, spiritual, and moral potential. We have all witnessed and are witnessing the priceless assistance provided by them wherever the necessary attention is paid to them. Officers' Assemblies must work in close contact with them.

While gratefully noting the tremendous effort contributed to the education of the personnel by writers, journalists, composers, and all the country's creative unions and organizations, with whom longstanding, cordial friendship links us, who understand the Army well and love it dearly, we would like to ensure that inspiring lines of current affairs writing, vivid examples of fiction, patriotic songs, films, shows, and poems—all this together, accompanies our officers throughout their difficult service, filling their spiritual life with the light of goodness, joy, and genuine humanism and helping them to resolve the complex problems arising in training and bringing up servicemen of the Soviet Army and Navy.

Comrades! There are probably more problems in the Army sphere today than the solutions that have been adopted. Officers are concerned about the organizational and staffing structure of combined units and units, about housing, about their badly organized working day, about the plethora of all kinds of commissions and checks, about mutual relations between seniors and juniors, about the lack of general culture, the position of unemployed wives, and many other great and small problems. We are aware of them and are trying to deal with them as far as possible. It is planned to issue a directive of the USSR defense minister and chief of the the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate on the results of the All-Service Officers' Assembly. However, I must say that for the moment no one will provide us with new financial means or new material resources—they are simply not available in the country. We are grateful for what we have received. It is necessary to identify internal reserves to improve the organization of officers' service and living conditions. They do exist.

They include the further democratization of Army and Navy life through the firm establishment of the authority of Officers' Assemblies, the transformation of relations in the officer sphere where only labor and the personal contribution of every officer to combat and mobilization readiness will determine his advancement in the service, his moral and material incentives, and much else. Protectionism and other hidden forms of sponging on the labor of comrades in the service must be eradicated from our life. The reserves also include the opening of the floodgates for the application of creative initiative and enterprise on the part of officer collectives, a sensible approach to the organization of military labor, and the acceleration of the pace of social transformations and transformations affecting daily life in every garrison.

Great tasks will have to be resolved in the course of the elections to the local and republic organs of power. Several thousand officers will run for people's deputy. The officer community must do everything in its power to ensure that truly selfless Soviet workers, genuine leaders of military collectives, authoritative and profoundly decent people, people with a clear conscience win the election struggle.

The speaker noted further: The CPSU Central Committee September Plenum adopted a decision to convene the 28th CPSU Congress. The Congress will be a truly political examination on the main subject of our life—perestroyka. Therefore we must conduct our entire organizational and educational work in such a way as to pass this examination with honor.

Yazov Sums up Results of Army Officers' Meeting

LD0812155689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Dec 89

[Text] The All-Army Officers' meeting has finished. Summing up the results of the forum, Comrade Yazov noted that it has given a new stimulus, toward consolidating and raising the political and service awareness of the officer corps, to renewing and affirming the quality and norms of an officer's daily activity, and the lofty conceptions of both dignity and honor. An appeal to the officers of the USSR Armed Forces was adopted.

Yazov Congratulates BAM Railroad Troops

90UM0152A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Congratulations to railroad troops by Defense Minister Dimitriy Yazov]

[Text] Chief of Railroad Troops Colonel General Comrade M.K. Makartsev.

Member of the Military Council and Chief of Railroad Troops Main Political Directorate Lieutenant General Comrade A.F. Stolyarov.

The railroad troops, warrant officers and officers, generals, workers and employees, veterans of the railroad troops, and labor collectives of patronage organizations—construction workers on the Eastern Section of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad Line imeni Leninskiy Komsomol.

Dear comrades!

On behalf of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, permit me to offer you my warm congratulations on your great labor victory—the permanent commissioning of the Eastern Section of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad Line [BAM] from Tynda to Komsomolsk-na-Amure.

Today, when radical perestroyka is under way energetically in all aspects of the life of Soviet society, the commissioning of the BAM for permanent operation with the projects of the 12th 5-Year Plan is of exceptional national economic importance. All conditions have been created for the very rapid exploitation of the natural resources of Siberia and the Far East, and a second railroad line has been opened to the Pacific Ocean. The USSR Ministry of Defense assesses highly the selfless labor of the BAM soldiers and their significant contribution to strengthening our country's economic and defensive might, and together with them we take pride in this new and shining page in the glorious history of the railroad troops.

For the present generation of Soviet people the BAM, built by the hands of the representatives of our multinational state, has become not a "monument to the age of stagnation", but a symbol of the courage and patriotism of the people, a road stretching into the future.

Thanks to the truly heroic labor of all personnel, workers and employees, railroad troops veterans, and all collectives of construction workers and operators and patronage organizations of the union republics, krays, oblasts, and cities over the past 15 years under severe climatic conditions on the Eastern Section of the BAM, a significant volume of construction and assembly work has been done. More than 1,500 kilometers of mainline and station track have been laid across the taiga and through looming swamp and permafrost, and more than 1,200 bridges and other artificial structures have been built. New cities and well-appointed settlements have risen up there. During this time, along the BAM the railroad troops have passed through a real school of courage and staunchness, combat and special training, a school of labor and moral indoctrination. Commanders and political workers, engineering and technical and economic personnel, political organizers, and party, trade union, and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations have gained rich experience in organizational and political indoctrination work. The motherland has assessed highly the shock labor of the soldiers of the BAM, and thousands of enlisted men, sergeants, warrant officers, and officers have been awarded orders and medals.

We express our firm conviction that personnel of the railroad troops will henceforth also fulfill with honor their crucial assignments in the construction of railroads and other important national economic projects, and will persistently master equipment and weapons, enhance their vigilance and combat readiness, and perfect their military and special skills.

We wish you, dear comrades, good health and new successes in your military labor for the good of our beloved motherland.

[signed] Army General D. Yazov, USSR Minister of Defense.
Army General A. Lizichev, Chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy.
2 December 1989.

Leningrad Rally Opposes Attacks on Army

PM0712110789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Letter from Lieutenant Colonel S. Bogomolov under the general heading "Army: Insiders' Views": "Spoken From the Heart"]

[Text] The okrug Officers' House in Leningrad has hosted a rally organized by the city War and Labor Veterans Council in defense of the army. The rally was addressed by USSR People's Deputy and Hero of Socialist Labor I. Klyuchkov, Great Patriotic War veterans V. Kavkayev, P. Dmitriyev, and F. Dyachenko, former internationalist servicemen O. Kasatkin, A. Rekun, and S. Kirichenko, and other comrades. They spoke indignantly about the unbridled campaign of attacks on our army launched not without help from the mass media.

The rally participants adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet calling for statesmanship and political vigilance to be displayed and for discrimination against the Armed Forces not to be tolerated.